The Roman *Collegia*

THE MODERN EVOLUTION OF AN ANCIENT CONCEPT

BY

JONATHAN S. PERRY

BRILL · MNEMOSYNE · SUPPLEMENTA

THE ROMAN *COLLEGIA*

MNEMOSYNE

SUPPLEMENTS

SUBSERIES

HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY OF CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY

EDITED BY

SUSAN E. ALCOCK
THOMAS HARRISON
WILLEM M. JONGMAN
H.S. VERSNEL

VOLUME CCLXXVII

JONATHAN SCOTT PERRY

THE ROMAN *COLLEGIA*

TUTA SUB AEGIDE PALLAS · 1683 ·

THE ROMAN *COLLEGIA*

THE MODERN EVOLUTION OF AN ANCIENT CONCEPT

BY

JONATHAN SCOTT PERRY

TUTA SUB AEGIDE PALLAS · 1683 ·

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON
2006

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Perry, Jonathan Scott.
The Roman collegia : the modern evolution of an ancient concept / by Jonathan S. Perry.
p. cm. — (Mnemosyne, supplements, ISSN 0169-8958 ; v. 277. History and archaeology of classical antiquity)
Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15080-5
ISBN-10: 90-04-15080-3 (hardback : alk. paper)
1. Fraternal organizations—History. I. Title. II. Series: Mnemosnyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum ; v. 277. III. Series: Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum. History and archaeology of classical antiquity.

HS1506.P47 2006
366—dc22

2006043928

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15080-5
ISBN-10: 90-04-15080-3

© Copyright 2006 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill Academic Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

To Laurence Michael Bains
and To Jerzy Linderski

Marito optimo
et
Magistro optimo

Depuis le XVIe siècle, l'esprit public, l'esprit des classes supérieures, des hommes cultivés, est formé à l'école de l'antiquité gréco-latine. Or, d'un trait de plume, vous voulez supprimer cette tradition quatre fois séculaire! . . . Et croyez-vous qu'on puisse impunément faire table rase de l'idéal ancien qui a fait ses preuves, pour mettre à sa place un idéal nouveau tout à fait différent, non éprouvé, dont les effets sont inconnus et difficiles à prévoir? . . . Un peuple ne change pas de culture et d'éducation comme un particulier change de maison.

Jean-Pierre Waltzing, in 1912
[Waltzing 1913, 20]

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements ix

Introduction 1

Chapter One Theodor Mommsen's '*Collegia Funeraticia*' and the Search for Christian Origins in the Nineteenth Century 23

Chapter Two Jean-Pierre Waltzing's 'Professional Associations' and the Legacy of Christian Democracy 61

Chapter Three *Collegia* and *Corporativismo* in Fascist Italy 89

Chapter Four *Collegia*, the Institute of Roman Studies, and 'Romanità' 119

Chapter Five *Collegia*, Race, and Roman Heritage under Giuseppe Bottai 155

Chapter Six Socialism and Sociability: The *Collegia* Since 1945 191

Conclusion *Autumn Journal*, Bottai's Journal, and the Relevance of Rome 215

Bibliography 225

Epigraphic Index 243
General Index 245

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It would appear that the Western world did not heed Waltzing's warning, issued from the (enviably comfortable) abode of 1912 Liège. We continue to move houses, each time thinking we are improving on the curricula concocted by our predecessors, and yet each style of accommodations appears even more cramped, faded, and pre-fabricated than the previous one. Or at least that is one possible reaction to the general position of Classics in the early twenty-first century, relative to its standing in the early twentieth.

Mercifully, some residents have resisted the urge to jettison the past and start afresh in new lodgings. First among these is Brill Academic Publishers, and the editors and assistant editors whose labors uphold one of the most vital and venerable institutions in our field. I cannot express, in adequate measure, my gratitude to Acquisitions Editor Irene van Rossum and to her assistants, Regine Reincke and Kim Fiona Plas, for allowing me the opportunity to publish a book with Brill. They have coupled the great honor of this association with many kindnesses and insights, and it has been fascinating for me to follow events in a country far more advanced than my own (at least at present).

Over the course of the many years spent in researching and writing this book, I have accumulated substantial debts to many remarkable individuals. When I was casting about for a suitable M.A. and then a Ph.D. topic, my advisor and mentor Richard J.A. Talbert suggested that I look into the Roman *collegia*. At every turn, he offered encouragement, sharp insight, and good sense, when I continued to drift. I was also very fortunate to have the reactions of a superb dissertation committee, which included Mary T. Boatwright, George W. Houston, Michael R. McVaugh, and Donald M. Reid. I am further grateful to Professor Boatwright, and to Professor Brent D. Shaw, for their support of my work, and for recommending my application to the NEH Seminar conducted at the American Academy in Rome in Summer 2004. This Seminar, the most intensive, fruitful, and delightful research experience of my career, was conducted by Professor Stephen L. Dyson. Every session and every outing reflected the intellectual breadth, insatiable curiosity, and boundless

energy he brought to the endeavor, and I will always be in his debt for this opportunity. The staff of the AAR did much to aid my research, as well, paving the way to crucial archival visits and to the treasures held in its own library.

I owe a special and grossly inadequate word of thanks to Professor Wolfgang Haase, the editor of the *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* and the most perceptive, rigorous, and helpful reader I could have desired. Since our initial contact in 1998, he has encouraged me to dig deeper, make a clearer argument, and draw on his seemingly inexhaustible wealth of bibliographic references. He fully deserves all of the accolades that have been cast his way by those of us fortunate enough to write for his journal. I am also extremely grateful to the number of anonymous readers who have critiqued my work, in various forms, and I have been privileged to have the responses of some of the world's best scholars, in multiple fields, including Marcello Barbanera, Craig Kallendorf, Christoph Konrad, Hans-Friedrich Müller, John R. Patterson, Stefan Rebenich, Gareth Schmeling, Alan H. Sommerstein, Marla Stone, and Onno M. van Nijf.

I am further grateful to Prof. Haase for allowing me to reprint material originally published in the *IJCT* 8, Fall 2001, 205–216, as 'Ancient *Collegia*, Modern Blackshirts?: The Study of Roman Corporations in Fascist Italy'. Portions of this article appear below, in Chapters Three and Six. Very many thanks are also offered to the Franz Steiner Verlag, for permission to utilize material originally published as, 'In honorem Theodori Mommseni: G.B. de Rossi and the *collegia funeraticia*', in C.F. Konrad (Ed.), *Augusto augurio: Rerum humanarum et divinarum commentationes in honorem Jerzy Linderski*, Stuttgart, 2004, 105–122. Portions of this article appear in Chapter One.

As will become apparent in the chapters that follow, I have been privileged to view materials in a number of archives in Belgium, Italy, and Germany. I extend my deepest thanks to those who are responsible for these materials, and to the archivists who facilitated my access to them, in 2001, 2002, and 2004. For the opportunity to use these letters, handwritten and typewritten documents, and special printed publications, I am grateful to Dr. Kornelia Küchmeister, of the Schleswig-Holsteinische Landesbibliothek, Kiel; to the staff of the Bibliothèque de l'Université de Liège, Liège; to the librarians of the Biblioteca di Diritto Romano of the Università di Bari; to Dott.ssa Clotilde D'Amato, of the Museo della Civiltà Romana, for showing

me unpublished materials related to the Mostra Augustea della Romanità and for a delightful tour of rooms normally closed to the public; to Dott.ssa Anna Lisa Cavazzuti, for assistance in using the Archivio Bottai of the Fondazione Mondadori, Milano, and to Signora Viviana Bottai, for her gracious permission to view these items; and to Dott.ssa Letizia Lanzetta, director of the Archivio Storico of the Istituto Nazionale di Studi Romani, Roma. I am further grateful to Dott.ssa Lanzetta, and to the INSR as a whole, for permission to publish material contained in its invaluable archive.

Nearer home, I have profited enormously from the assistance of several talented linguists and dear friends, including Prof. Luigi Ferri, Dr. Robert M. McClure, Agnès Ruhlmann Nenna, Petra Tempel Rhode, Thomas Robinson, and Prof. Vladimir Solonari. Each one has saved me from a series of blunders, and one of the great joys of this project has been to talk with them about their individual languages and how important ideas are expressed through them. I could have done nothing along the lines I envisioned without the talented and efficient interlibrary loan staff of the University of Central Florida: Deirdre Campbell, Joan Reynolds, Kristine Shrauger, and, especially, Dr. Winnie Tyler. They and my colleagues at UCF have made up for an otherwise bleak experience, and I am especially grateful to my chairs, Richard Crepeau and Edmund Kallina, Jr., as well as to the scholar-teachers who have most inspired me in my work, Bruce F. Pauley and Shirley Leckie.

I am very glad to be able to quote Professor Leckie's advice to me, that, in the final analysis, 'no book is ever perfect and without mistakes. Don't hold things up trying for perfection, although you will certainly try hard to be as error free and accurate as possible. In the end, history is always an unfinished business.' I have tried to be as accurate as I can be, but I now appreciate, more than ever before, the sentiment Dr. Leckie has so aptly expressed here. Given the topics I have covered and the way I have seen fit to handle them, I am certain to have made a number of mistakes. For none of these is any person I have named here in any way responsible. On the other hand, as nothing in history is really 'finished business', anyway, I look forward to the chance to apologize for those errors.

The book is dedicated to the two men who, more than any others, made this strange and difficult work possible. I happily dedicate it to Larry, my *sine quo non*, and to the day when what I have written

here will be fully and legally true. He has suffered with this book as long as I have, and he has done so with substantially better character and better-heartedness. I am also honored to dedicate the book to Professor Linderski, the Doktorvater for me and for so many others, whose erudition and generosity are the ideals to which I aspire, but will never reach. He gave me the very best piece of news, when my spirits were at their very lowest ebb, and the most fitting thing one can say of him is what Theodor Mommsen said of G.B. De Rossi, 'Der große Gelehrte [ist] auch ein guter Mann.'

INTRODUCTION

In 134 CE, in the city of Catina (modern Catania) in Sicily, a 17-year-old boy was crushed to death when a marble block fell from the scaffold above his head. (It had been balanced there—precariously, as it turned out—by a fellow laborer at the site.) L. Arrius Secundus had been too engrossed in his immediate task, the chiseling of a fine marble inlay for a private residence, to notice the imminent danger to his life, and the blow, when it came, was swift and deadly. Luckily, he had made provision for his funeral, should he die on the job, which seemed an all-too-likely prospect, based on the recent experiences of his co-workers. This provision amounted to a 'decent funeral', which in this case meant an adequately sized burial plot, outside the city walls, and an inscribed tombstone.

The dividend was to be paid to Arrius' parents by his fellow '*Marmorarii*', who had hit upon a unique—and apparently legal—method of burial insurance. They had pledged to bury each other, regardless of the dead man's age, number of dependents, or personal finances, though it was assumed that most would be young men, without spouses or substantial wealth. To seal the pledge, each man contributed 50 sesterces, every month, to the organization's common treasury, and any man who died in the following month would be buried at the group's expense. (On this occasion, though, it was whispered that young Arrius really should have been more careful. After all, the boy had only contributed for the six months he had been working at the site, and it seemed likely that there would have to be a special collection to pay for his funeral, given the perilous state of the group's finances, just at present.)

Nevertheless, over the course of his—regrettably short—connection with the *Marmorarii*, Arrius had greatly enjoyed their monthly banquets, the stated purpose of which was to collect the *stips menstrua*, but which generally dissolved into drunken revels, persisting long into the wee hours. In recognition of their penchant for merrymaking, the members of the organization had styled themselves the '*Marmorarii Convivae*', and Arrius had considered himself fortunate to have fallen among this group of men in his first job. Accordingly, when he died in such a tragic fashion, the *Marmorarii Convivae* (some

willingly and others grudgingly) paid for his burial, and erected a tombstone inscribed:

DMS
L•ARRIUS
SECUNDUS
VIX•AN•XVII
MARMORARI [sic]
CONVIVE [sic] FECER(unt)

* * *

In 234 CE, in the city of Catina (modern Catania) in Sicily, a 17-year-old boy died after a lingering illness at the home of his father, a marble-layer, and surrounded by his father's friends and associates from work. L. Arrius Secundus had always known and relied upon these men, who habitually shared in all the major events of each other's lives. Luckily, Arrius' father had made provision for his son's funeral, should he die in adolescence, which was an all-too-likely occurrence, given the dramatic rise in such deaths in recent years. This provision amounted to a 'decent funeral' for one's children, which in this case meant an adequately sized burial plot, outside the city walls, the hiring of professional mourners, and an inscribed tombstone.

The dividend was to be paid to the parents by the father's fellow '*Marmorarii*', who had hit upon a unique—and apparently legal—method of burial insurance. They had pledged to bury each other's children, regardless of their age or gender. To seal the pledge, each would contribute 250 HS, on the child's birthday every year, to the organization's common treasury, and any dependent who died in the following month would be buried at the group's expense. (On this occasion, however, it was whispered that Arrius' father had, over the years, contributed far more than was actually spent on his son's funeral, but such calculations were thought unseemly at this sad time.)

Nevertheless, over the course of his lengthy association with the '*Marmorarii*', Arrius' father had always looked forward to the banquet that was held, annually, on Mercury's birthday. Invariably, this feast was accompanied by solemn ceremonies, and certain rituals whose secrets were not to be divulged to the uninitiated. In recognition of their sociable, but sober, fraternization, the members of the

organization had styled themselves the '*Marmorarii Convivae*'. Accordingly, when L. Arrius Secundus passed away, the *Marmorarii* joined their friend in burying his son, and they erected a tombstone to his memory inscribed:

DMS
L•ARRIUS
SECUNDUS
VIX•AN•XVII
MARMORARI [sic]
CONVIVE [sic] FECER(unt)

* * *

In 34 CE, in the city of Catina (modern Catania) in Sicily, a 17-year-old boy was killed when a group of his grandfather's slaves revolted against their master. Even though they had threatened to launch yet another Slave War, calling on the ghost of Eunus in their effort,[1] the rebellion did not spread to other households and was quickly suppressed, once its leaders had been caught and executed. However, the community was shaken, being forced to deal with the murder of a promising young man. L. Arrius Secundus was an adolescent, but he had already made a name for himself throughout eastern Sicily, as the last scion of a noble but recently impoverished family. Luckily for both himself and his family, a local association of '*Marmorarii*' volunteered to pay for his funeral, in gratitude for his grandfather's benefactions in more prosperous days. The organization's offer consisted of a burial plot, a group of mourners, a large amount of incense to be consumed at the funeral, an escort to the gravesite, and an inscribed tombstone.

A special collection was taken from these marble-workers, to which most members contributed, but not in equal measure. It was estimated that if each of the 30 regular members would kick in 10 HS, the elements of an appropriate, if not extravagant, funeral could be purchased. (On this occasion, however, it was whispered that Q. Junius Silanus had only offered 3 HS, an act of meanness that was remembered for years to come.)

[1] When Eunus launched his rebellion in the 130s BCE in Enna, the daughter of the 'sadistic' slave-owners Damophilus and Megallis was given safe escort to her relatives in Catina. Further, Bradley 1989, 58–60.

This outcome was all the more distressing because these '*Marmorarii*' were known, throughout Catina and elsewhere, for their generosity and great-heartedness to those in need. In fact, they had styled themselves the '*Marmorarii Convivae*', because of their semi-annual banquets, to which they customarily invited 20 of the city's poorest residents. Of course, the Arrii were conceded to be a special case, and the untimely death of the sole support of a declining family was deeply felt by the group. Accordingly, the '*Marmorarii Convivae*' paid for his burial, and erected a tombstone inscribed:

DMS
L•ARRIUS
SECUNDUS
VIX•AN•XVII
MARMORARI [sic]
CONVIVE [sic] FECER(unt)

* * *

Any of these scenarios, and innumerable others, might have preceded the inscribing of the tombstone whose contents were ultimately published as *C. I. L.* 10.7039. The inscription is, of course, too brief to support any such extrapolation. No other group of '*Marmorarii*'—'convivial' or otherwise—is attested in Catania. Indeed, among the many things we do not know about this occasion are when it took place, who L. Arrius Secundus was and how he died, what prompted the '*Marmorarii*' to act, why they were further designated '*Convivae*', and what, specifically, was encompassed by their 'doing' this.

At one point in *Death and Renewal*, Keith Hopkins considered a similar scenario that might have preceded burial by a 'funeral club' in the Roman Empire. Observing that death was 'both unpredictable and expensive,' he proffered the case of a widow with young children, who could not afford to lavish money on a monument in honor of her dead husband.[2] Just as we can, in our culture, insure ourselves against the risk of such an event, so, he reasoned, this widow might have had recourse to a 'burial-club', provided that the deceased had been a member. However reasonable this 'stop-gap measure' may seem to us, though, it does raise a number of apparently insol-

[2] Hopkins 1983, 213.

uble questions. For example, did the widow *herself* belong to this generic society? Could she have been a member of one, independent of her husband? Would she have enrolled each child in it individually, if at all? Alternatively, might she merely have been a beneficiary of the college's charity? Need she have been associated with the group in any way, were this the case? Would her name, or those of her children, have appeared on the tombstone inscription provided by the college, or was she completely without a role in the commemoration of her husband?

As these questions suggest, one can never be certain of the motivations of the person or persons who have commemorated the dead, and the precise relationships between societal constraint, personal grief, and social expectation are impossible to resolve. In their groundbreaking article on tombstone inscriptions,[3] Saller and Shaw demonstrated that family structures and inheritance patterns could be discerned in these texts, but, in the final analysis, the grounds for the *decision* to commemorate the deceased are completely lost to us.[4] The formulaic nature of inscriptions may or may not mask genuine feeling,[5] and it must be admitted that, despite their tangible and seemingly straightforward nature, these texts could be just as duplicitous and unreliable as any other. If a term is mentioned only once, in one obscure inscription, there may be little hope today of resurrecting its precise meaning, within the culture (or for the individual?) who created it.

Nevertheless, prior to the late nineteenth-century, when the surviving inscriptional records were collected and organized into bound volumes by a group of (apparently indefatigable) scholars, the situation for many fields of Roman social history was even more bleak. For one example, before the creation of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, students of Roman society had been dimly aware of the existence of '*collegia*', a set of associations that appeared most often, in the extant sources, in the context of official licensing and/or restriction. Drawing on these sources, it appeared that the 'history' of the Roman *collegia* could be divided into three basic phases.

---

[3] Saller and Shaw 1984.

[4] For a reconsideration of the conclusions in Saller and Shaw 1984, see Martin 1996.

[5] Among many others, see Golden 1988 and King 2000.

According to Plutarch,[6] Numa Pompilius had extended permission to *collegia* of craftsmen to assemble, organize, and regulate their individual trades as they saw fit. While this seems an implausibly early date for the beginning of the phenomenon, it does appear that such groups were relatively free to assemble during the Republic, at least until its final decades. In the mid-first-century BCE, '*collegia*' came to be associated with armed gangs, and the government reacted, in a series of measures that carried over into the Augustan period, to restrict their freedom of action. This initiated the second phase, covering the roughly two centuries of the Principate, in which *collegia* were regulated by the emperors, but not always in the furtherance of a consistent policy. The most useful evidence for official attitudes to *collegia* derived from the famous correspondence between Trajan and Pliny the Younger, who was serving as his legate in Bithynia. In two letters, Trajan expressed his fear of the disruptions untrammeled freedom of assembly could cause, while also desiring not to appear too tyrannical in adopting a needlessly heavy-handed policy in this regard. When Pliny proposed to organize a standing fire brigade (a '*collegium fabrum*') for one of his cities, Trajan nixed the plan, reminding Pliny, 'But we must remember that that province, and particularly those cities, have been disrupted by organizations of this kind. Whatever name we give them, and for whatever purpose, men who have gathered together in them will become political "hetaeriae" in short order.'[7] On the other hand, Trajan also allowed a city (admittedly of special status) to maintain its 'benefit societies', on the grounds of its unique treaty obligations and with the proviso that 'their collections are employed not for the purposes of rioting and illicit assemblies but for the sustenance of the poor.'[8]

However, there seemed, on the basis of the legal codes of Late Antiquity, to have been a shift in imperial thinking about the *collegia*, at some point in the third and throughout the fourth and fifth centuries CE. The *collegia* evolved into '*corpora*', created, managed, and regulated directly by the State, and most of these associations seem to have been concerned with services in the 'public interest', and especially the provision and transportation of food, wine, and

[6] *Numa*, 17.

[7] *Ep.* X, 33–34. Notice that Trajan uses the Greek term here, to connote a 'political club' or a 'political faction', masquerading as a legitimate organization.

[8] *Ep.* X, 92–93.

other essentials for the urban population. The questions then arose to what extent medieval 'guild' systems had evolved from their Late Roman antecedents, and whether the fall of Rome also meant the collapse of the collegial style of workers' organization. And there, in essence, the case stood, until the modern, systematic excavation and collation of epigraphic materials, especially over the course of the nineteenth century. By the fin-de-siècle, roughly 2500 inscriptions, naming nearly 200 distinct *collegia*, had been identified, and the rapid infusion of this sizeable corpus of texts would revolutionize the study of *collegia* well into the following century. The bulk of these items dated to that second phase of collegial history, although this also reflected the trend of the Roman 'epigraphic habit' generally.[9] Nevertheless, it was now possible, for the first time, to document—so far as these texts would allow—the inner workings of the *collegia*, in a key period in their development.

The availability of a compendium of inscriptions in the massive volumes of *C. I. L.* has, of course, been a great advantage to every scholar of the ancient world. For students of the *collegia*, this has been especially true, as most of the volumes[10] contain an index specifically devoted to '*Collegia et principales eorum*', or some variant of this phrase, and they list the individual items that seem to fall within this narrow category. However, it must also be admitted that the very arrangement of these materials has led to unwarranted and unprovable hypotheses, not all of which have been sufficiently challenged to date. The attractiveness of the evidence, systematically collected and organized for the first time, has led epigraphists to draw parallels between the ancient past and their contemporary present. As such, institutions and circumstances that were utterly foreign to the Romans have been passed along to the unsuspecting reader, as being strangely similar to something in his/her own society.

The 'Mat-Men' as Provincial Firefighters

A case in point concerns the '*collegia centonariorum*', a set of *collegia* that are still, and very often today, labelled 'provincial fire brigades',

---

[9] See esp. MacMullen 1982 and Meyer 1990.

[10] *L'Année Épigraphique* has also preserved this item in its indices, as 'Collèges et métiers'.

composed of men who habitually used *centones* (mats) to extinguish flames. This is the meaning enshrined in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, to the effect that a '*centonarius*' was 'A fireman who used mats for extinguishing fires.'[11] Had one been told only the name of the group, s/he would assume, naturally enough, that the craft in question was a form of low-quality textile manufacture. However, since the late nineteenth century, when many of the volumes of *C. I. L.* were being compiled, the obvious conclusion was discarded, in favor of one that seemed to be more in keeping with stray literary references and an emerging consensus of epigraphic opinion.

As is well known, the Emperor Augustus commissioned a brigade of freedmen as the Vigiles (Night-Patrol) for the city of Rome, in 6 CE. Cohorts of Vigiles patrolled Ostia and Puteoli, as well,[12] but this appears to have been the limit of their responsibility. Naturally enough, then, modern scholars were drawn to the question of what, if any, fire-prevention measures the other cities of the Empire, great and small, would have taken. Some suggested that smaller brigades, modeled on the Vigiles of the capital, functioned in provincial communities, and Otto Hirschfeld, the initial editor of the Gallic volumes of *C. I. L.*, thought he had discovered proof of this in an inscription uncovered at Nîmes. This text[13] lists the offices held by a C. Fulvius Lupus Servilianus, among which was 'Praefect of the Vigiles'. In an article published in 1884, Hirschfeld argued that Fulvius had not been a Prefect at Rome; rather, he had directed a group of *local* firefighters stationed at Nemausus.[14]

In making this argument, Hirschfeld had been reminded of a fragmentary inscription found at Lyon,[15] which records the vow of T. Flavius Latinianus, who was also styled a 'Praefect of the Vigiles'. Because the stone breaks off under 'PRAEFECTUS VIGILUM', he could not be certain whether 'at Rome' or 'at Lyon' followed. (Of course, the stonecutter (like the one of 12.3166) might also have seen

[11] *Oxford Latin Dictionary* 1982, s.v. 'centōnārius'.

[12] Suetonius, *Claudius* 25: 'Puteolis et Ostiae singulas cohortes ad arcendos incendiorum casus collocavit.'

[13] *C. I. L.* 12.3166: 'C. Fulvio C. fil. Vol. Lupo Serviliano adlecto inter praetor[ios] ad Imp(eratore) Caesare Aug(usto) Vespas[iano] praefecto alae Longinian[ae] quattuorvir(o) ad aerarium pontifici PRAEFECTO VIGI[lum] Julia D. fil. concess(a) viro.'

[14] Hirschfeld 1884, 240–241.

[15] *C. I. L.* 13.1745: 'I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) Depulsori et diis deabusque omnibus et Genio loci T. Flav[ius] Latinianus praefectus vigilum. . . .'

no need to specify the location at all.) Accordingly, in his edition of the Lyon inscription for *C. I. L.* in 1899, Hirschfeld would observe, 'It is uncertain whether he [Flavius] should be understood to have been a Praefect of the Vigiles at Rome or at Lyon.'[16] However, in the 1884 article, he had been reasonably convinced of a local identification, noting that 'it is presumed that he held office in Lyon (and not in Rome).'[17]

While his conclusion might be challenged, with reference to another inscription from Nemausus, *C. I. L.* 12.2228, which named a third-century Praefect of the Vigiles that was clearly linked to Rome, Hirschfeld's argument proceeded along these lines. If local firefighting institutions did exist, he reasoned, perhaps they and the Roman Vigiles had evolved independently from a common ancestor. Such an ancestor was readily apparent in the '*nyktophylakes*', the Night-Watch of Hellenistic Alexandria.[18] Building upon a suggestion made by Joachim Marquardt,[19] he averred that these Gallic Praefects had acted as 'fire chiefs', supervising the many *collegia* of '*fabri*' in the area, who were the actual firefighters. The clear basis for this argument was the above-mentioned exchange of letters between Trajan and Pliny.[20] When fire destroyed several prominent homes in Nicomedia, the Bithynian capital, in which not a single piece of firefighting equipment was to be found, Pliny dared to seek permission from the Emperor to establish a '*collegium fabrum*'. As Pliny seems to have envisioned it, the brigade would be a standing firefighting force 'of about 150 men'. As noted above, Trajan expressed his displeasure with the idea, on the grounds that this hypothetical group would, like others already in existence, pose an unnecessary risk to public order.

---

[16] *C. I. L.* 1899, volume 13, page 265: 'Praefectus vigilum utrum Romae an Lugduni intellegendus sit incertum est, cf. supra p. 250.' [For this connection, see below.]

[17] Hirschfeld 1884, 240, Anm. 2.

[18] Strabo (17.1.12) lists 'ho nukterinos stratēgos' among the traditional officials at Alexandria. Augustus apparently introduced such an official to Rome, as head of the newly-created Vigiles. In Greek, the term 'Vigiles' remained 'hoi nuktophulakes' (Josephus, *BJ* 4.11.4 [on the events of 69 CE], and Dio, 55.26.5 [on Augustus' creation of the Vigiles].)

[19] Marquardt later included the idea in his famous *Das Privatleben der Römer* [Marquardt 1886, 719]: 'Von diesen haben die *centonarii* ihren Namen von dem Gebrauch der *centones*, die zu dem Löschapparat gehören. . . .' Furthermore, the *fabri* served 'als Feuerlöschcorps'.

[20] Pliny, *Ep.* X.33–34.

However, for the purpose of identifying his 'prefect', Hirschfeld assumed that colleges of *fabri*, which were rapidly coming to light in a host of inscriptions in Italy and the Western provinces, had *customarily* been 'employed as a fire-extinguishing system.'[21] Having noticed that, in inscriptions, the *fabri* were often paired with colleges of '*centonarii*', Hirschfeld then suggested that the *centonarii* had been organized to serve a similar function.[22] While one might reasonably have concluded that these 'mat-men' had actually received their title from the mats that they produced, Hirschfeld preferred to identify the *centonarii* as 'mat-wielders (against flames)' rather than as simply 'mat-producers'. He formulated his definition thus, 'As it is well-known that these *centones* were applied primarily as a fire-extinguishing material,[23] I do not therefore hesitate to explain the *collegium centonariorum* as an organization assembled for assistance in case of fires—simply stated, as a volunteer fire department [freiwillige Feuerwehr].'[24] Accordingly, Hirschfeld rejected what would have seemed the obvious translation of '*collegium fabrum et centonariorum*' [i.e. 'college of craftsmen and mat-makers'] in favor of this more complex one. It is also clear that, in making this deduction, he had brought a wholly modern sensibility about fire-prevention to bear on the ancient evidence. Observing that the major European cities had only recently established standing fire-brigades, Hirschfeld exaggerated the Romans' foresight in this regard.[25] In fact, our sources suggest that the ancients,

---

[21] Hirschfeld 1884, 243.

[22] See also his comments in *C. I. L.* 13, pp. 250–251: 'Vigilum cohortem Luguduni constitisse inde certe colligi non potest, cum etiam Nemausi, ubi praefectus vigilum et armorum fungebatur, non vigiles, sed, ut alibi, collegia fabrum et centonariorum, quae Luguduni quoque haud semel memorantur, incendiis arcendis praesto fuerint.'

[23] This seems to be the sense of at least three passages: Caesar, *BC* 2.9.4: 'eamque contabulationem summam lateribus lutoque constraverunt, ne quid ignis hostium nocere posset, centonesque insuper iniecerunt, ne aut tela tormentis immissa tabulationem perfringerent aut saxa ex catapultis latericium discuterent'; Caesar, *BC* 3.44.7: 'magnusque incesserat timor sagittarum atque omnes fere milites aut ex coactis aut ex centonibus aut ex coriis tunicas aut tegimenta fecerant, quibus tela vitarent'; L. Cornelius Sisenna, as quoted by Nonius, Frag. 65 (107P): 'puppes aceto madefactis centonibus integuntur, quos supra perpetua classi suspensa cilicia obtenduntur.'

[24] Hirschfeld 1884, 246: 'Da nun aber bekanntlich diese *centones* in erster Linie als Feuerlöschmittel verwendet worden sind, so stehe ich nicht an, das *collegium centonariorum* als eine zur Hilfeleistung bei Bränden zusammengetretene Vereinigung, mit einem Wort als freiwillige Feuerwehr zu erklären.'

[25] Hirschfeld 1884, 255–256. Further, he notes that Paris did not establish a

especially those not fortunate enough to live in Rome itself, were far more interested in extinguishing and rebuilding *after*, rather than preparing *before*, an outbreak of fire.

Perhaps the most significant piece of evidence Hirschfeld adduced for his hypothesis concerning provincial fire departments was an inscription that mentions both a college of '*fabri*' and a '*dolabrarius*'. Found in Aquileia, and now ensconced in a museum in Vienna, this text (5.908) reads:[26]

TI. CLAUDIUS
TI. CLAUDI
EPAPHRODITIAN(i)
VET(erani) LEG(ionis) VII CL(audianae) P(iae) F(idelis)
FIL(ius) ASTYLUS
DOLABRAR(ius) COL(legii) FAB(rum)
VIVOS FECIT SIBI ET
IULIAE DIONYSIADI
CONIUGI
BENE DE SE MER(itae)

The text itself was intriguing, as epigraphers learned about a hitherto unknown office or a specialized function within a *collegium fabrum*. However, it was Theodor Mommsen's description of the figures that appear on the sides of the monument that most fascinated scholars. To the left of the text stands, in Mommsen's estimation, a woman wearing a stola and carrying a crown in her left hand, and to the right, 'a young man in pallium, carrying what may be a cento in his right hand and a dolabra in his left.' Photographs and sketches of the image corroborate what Mommsen claimed, but only up to a point.[27] The young man is certainly carrying a *dolabra*, or some such tool, in his left hand, but there is no trace on the stone of the '*cento*' that Mommsen saw in the figure's right hand.[28] Nonetheless,

standing 'Pompierkorps' until 1716 and that Berlin, Vienna, and St. Petersburg only followed suit a few decades later.

[26] Noll 1983, 248–249; Zaccaria 1987, 129.

[27] Daremberg and Saglio 1892, s.v. 'dolabra', 329 (for a sketch of the male figure); Zaccaria 1987, between 136 and 137 (for photographs of both the female and male figures).

[28] Zaccaria 1987, 131, n. 6, notes, 'In realtà, almeno nella riproduzione fotografica, non è agevole identificare l'oggetto che pende dalla mano destra della figura.' The sketch in Daremberg and Saglio 1892 does not carry an object in this hand, at all.

subsequent scholars accepted Mommsen's description as valid, and they discussed the picture in relation to both the *centonarii* and provincial firefighting.

Convinced that the figure was not a cult symbol or a mere decorative effect, Hirschfeld concluded that the image depicted the deceased man and that the tools of his trade had been pictured with him. Hirschfeld recalled that, according to the *Digest*, the Vigiles were supposed to rush to the scene of a fire carrying buckets and hatchets.[29] Accordingly, this '*dolabrarius*' must have been a member of a special subdivision of firefighters responsible for tearing down buildings in order to form firebreaks. A dedication by a 'century' of *dolabrarii* at Comum seemed to confirm this surmise.[30] In Hirschfeld's opinion, the representation of a *dolabrarius*, coupled with this mention of a specialized corps within a college of *centonarii*, 'left no doubt' as to the role the *dolabrarius* had served in provincial firefighting units.

Nevertheless, one could make a series of strong objections to this unique prop to Hirschfeld's theory. First of all, he assumed that the image carved alongside the text was directly related to it. In my own collection of *centonarii* inscriptions (over 200 individual items), I observed that none of the images inscribed together with the texts could, in any obvious way, be linked to the inscribed words. Rather, the most popular images on the stones were, in order of their frequency, dolphins and roses (3 each), lions, birds, and pinecones (2 each), and crowns, bears, and horses (1 each).[31] Moreover, none of the other colleges of *fabri* or *centonarii* seems to have chosen to depict the deceased or his occupation in life. Given the fact that the text was inscribed while Ti. Claudius Astylus was still alive, it seems reasonable that the two images depict the husband and wife described in the text. However, one might, by comparing other texts from Aquileia, also speculate that the characters were cult symbols of some kind.[32]

Most significantly, though, neither the relief nor the text of the inscription connects the *dolabrarius* specifically with firefighting. Even if we accept that the pictured implement is actually a *dolabra* (and

[29] Hirschfeld 1884, 246, Anm. 1, citing *Digest* 1.15.3.3 (Paulus, *De officio praefecti vigilum*): 'sciendum est autem praefectum vigilum per totam noctem vigilare debere et coerrare calciatum cum hamis et dolabris. . . .'

[30] *C. I. L.* 5.5446: '. . . centuria centonar(iorum) dolabrar(iorum) scalar[i]or(um). . . .'

[31] Perry 1994, now superseded by the collections in Lafer 2001 and Liu 2004.

[32] Compare the text of *C. I. L.* 5.1220, also found at Aquileia, which is bounded on the left and right sides by the heads of Silenus and Pan.

not a *securis* or an *ascia*, for example), we need not assume that this pick was used only to create firewalls. Because Columella suggests using a '*dolabella*' to break up the ground around grapevines, the '*dolabrarius*' might, with a bit of imagination, have been the college's gardener.[33] At Altinum, an Ogius Patroclus donated the gardens adjoining his mausoleum to the local college of *centonarii*.[34] Might a *dolabrarius*, like this one at Aquileia, have been in charge of its upkeep? Indeed, a *dolabra* could have been wielded in other ways of interest to a college. An inscription with similar reliefs follows immediately upon the published version of the Aquileian one in *C. I. L.* On the left side of this text (5.909) is pictured 'a man, with his cloak hitched up at the waist, holding an ax and disembowelling a sow hanging from a nail.' A representation of a knife was added beneath this gruesome scene. Might we then conclude that this man, C. Cornelius Successus, was a hog-butcher? Also, because we are told that Cornelius had served as a soldier, might he have been the unit's cook? Oddly enough, the *Digest* also lists the *dolabra* as a butcher's tool.[35]

This is an intriguing possibility, to be sure, but, more realistically, one might also conclude that the *dolabrarius* performed religious, and not firefighting, duties for the college. Similar to the *securis* or *culter* (like those pictured in *C. I. L.* 5.909), the *dolabra* was known to have been a common instrument for animal sacrifice. Festus defines the '*scena*' or '*sacena*' as a 'pontifical dolabra'.[36] Thus, the Aquileian *dolabrarius* might have been pictured holding the implement with which he typically performed sacrifices. Collegial inscriptions frequently mention '*cultors*' and '*magistri officiorum*' among their number, and, in the course of their duties to both the gods and the dead, the colleges may have appreciated the presence of a 'sacrificer on-call,' as it were. This identification might also explain why the figure is pictured in a pallium, which could be hitched up to facilitate his work.

As the volumes of *C. I. L.* continued to appear in the nineteenth century, scholars, determined to connect the *dolabrarii* with firefighting,

---

[33] Columella, *De re rustica* 4.24.4: 'nam ut ab ima vite quasi a quibusdam fundamentis incipiam, semper circa crus dolabella dimovenda terra est.'

[34] *C. I. L.* 5.2176: 'L. Ogius Patroclus secutus pietatem col(legium) cent(onariorum) hortos cum aedificio huic sepult[a] iunctos vivos donavit. . . .'

[35] *Dig.* 33.7.18: 'cum de lanionis instrumento quaeritur, semota carne mensas pondera ferramentaque laniandae carnis causa praeparata, item trutinas cultros dolabras instrumento relinquimus.'

[36] Festus, Fragment 466.4: 'scena ab alis, a quibusdam sacena appellatur dolabra pontificalis.'

ignored these plausible suggestions, but Hirschfeld's conclusion was not universally endorsed at the time. In his 1886 Frankfurt dissertation, Hermann Maué took vigorous exception to the theory. While he was in the midst of compiling all inscriptions related to *fabri*, *centonarii*, and *dendrophorii* in the Roman Empire, Maué turned his attention to Hirschfeld's recent article, 'in keeping with the authority which the opinion of a distinguished epigrapher may demand.'[37] In short, the evidence for Hirschfeld's identification appeared 'not at all convincing' to Maué, who listed six objections to the firefighting hypothesis (16–19). Notwithstanding this criticism, Hirschfeld's deduction found its way into the standard reference guides on the subject, as they appeared in the 1890s and 1900s. For the *Dizionario epigrafico* entry for 'Centonarius', Giuseppe Gatti followed Hirschfeld in labeling the college of *centonarii* 'a voluntary association constituted for lending assistance in case of fire,' and, for the corresponding segment of the *Realencyclopädie*, Wilhelm Kubitschek observed that the colleges of *centonarii* served as the fire departments in many cities, 'making use of their *centones* as fire-extinguishers.'[38] A decade later, Ernst Kornemann composed a lengthy article on the 'Fabri', appending a list of all epigraphic mentions of the *fabri* and *centonarii* that had been found, to date. He similarly concluded that, while these colleges may have begun as craftsmen organizations, they were thereafter 'called up as a firefighting service.'[39]

Most importantly, Jean-Pierre Waltzing, in what is still the standard book on the *collegia* (see Chapter 2) endorsed Hirschfeld's identification, though he took the point even further, suggesting that the *centonarii* were organized brigades of professional 'sapeurs-pompiers' rather than a 'voluntary fire department'.[40] The basic link between these colleges and firefighting, in Italy and the provinces, has continued to dominate thinking on the subject. While most recent studies have deferred to Hirschfeld and Waltzing, there have been some skeptics in this regard, though only, it seems, in the past decade. My own M.A. thesis (1994) aired a few objections, but the first challenge to the notion in print seems to have been Onno van Nijf's 1997 book on the *collegia* of the Empire's Eastern provinces. van Nijf

[37] Maué 1886, 16.
[38] Gatti 1895, 2, 180; Kubitschek 1899, 3, 1933–1934.
[39] Kornemann 1909, 6, 1888–1925.
[40] Waltzing 1896, II, 194–208.

argued that there was a better way to evaluate the *collegia* of *fabri*, *centonarii*, and '*dendrophori*' (the three were often associated in inscriptions and are sometimes identified as the '*tria collegia*'), without resorting to their supposed 'fire-fighting' services to the communities in which they functioned. In fact, they may have served 'as a *de facto* status group for a wide group of craftsmen and traders, presumably the most ambitious and wealthy craftsmen in town.'[41] Accordingly, he makes the telling—and, to my mind, convincing—point that a group's title need not reflect its actual function, nor should we even seek out 'practical' functions, when the quest for status and position may, by itself, have provided the reason for its creation and maintenance.[42] Van Nijf continued his analysis in a 1999 article on the 'three *collegia*', suggesting that '*centonarii*' are better understood without a specific craft or function attached to their title,[43] and Jinyu Liu, in her 2004 Columbia dissertation, has continued this analysis by placing the *centonarii* in their geographic and occupational context, drawing out fascinating observations about their roles within the ancient economy.[44]

However, most of the scholarly literature on the subject has not dislodged the notion of a provincial 'freiwillige Feuerwehr'. In an article entitled 'Die fabri, fabri tignuarii, fabri subaediani, centonarii und dolabrarii als Feuerwehren in den Städten Italiens und der westlichen Provinzen,' Peter Kneissl departed from the standard reading only by suggesting that the *centonarii* did not derive their name from actual '*centones*'. Rather, they willingly joined with the members of other *collegia* solely in order to reap the social benefits of associating with firefighters.[45] Thus, while he was not tied to the literal reading of the title, itself, Kneissl still believed that there were provincial fire-brigades, basing his arguments essentially on the same evidence Hirschfeld had adduced. This opinion can also be seen in Robert Sablayrolles' 1996 book on the Vigiles, who notes that the three colleges united in order to fulfill their role as firemen,[46] and in a recent

---

[41] van Nijf 1997, 179.

[42] Further, on this point, see below, Chapter 6.

[43] van Nijf 1999, 201 with n. 12: 'Het is misschien maar beter om er van uit te gaan dat de *centonarii* niet optraden als een specifieke beroepsvereniging.'

[44] Liu 2004. [I am grateful to Prof. Liu for sharing her dissertation proposal and early research on the subject with me.]

[45] Kneissl 1994.

[46] Sablayrolles 1996, 62–63: 'Le lien fréquent qu'établissent les inscriptions entre

article on the *collegium centonariorum* at Comum. The latter suggests that it was possible for *centonarii* to be dedicated to professional activities, but, when circumstances demanded, they could also be pressed into public service as firemen.[47] Indeed, the newest book to appear on the subject leaves no doubt as to the validity of the firefighting hypothesis. Collecting and organizing all of the *centonarii* inscriptions, Renate Lafer begins her book with an account of firefighting in Rome and the provinces, and then discusses their role as 'freiwillige Feuerwehrvereine' instituted 'zur Brandbekämpfung'.[48]

Nevertheless, while the question is an intriguing one, and one might be tempted to draw certain definite conclusions about who the *centonarii* were and how they functioned within their communities, I would argue that there is a more pressing—and perhaps a more interesting—point to be made here. To begin, one might attempt to reconstruct Hirschfeld's process of reasoning regarding his evidence. Aware that the city of Rome had a firefighting service—of a sort, as it was not terribly successful, for instance, in 64 CE—Hirschfeld apparently deduced that other Roman cities would have benefited from some comparable form of fire protection. In fact, he posited that, given Pliny's request, the inscriptions he had discovered, and a few allusions to firefighting in literary sources, there *must* have been some 'freiwillige Feuerwehr', at least in the larger cities of Italy and the western provinces. Perhaps this was the effect merely of scholarly judiciousness and precise evaluation of evidence. However, one might also consider the context in which Hirschfeld was writing, a world in which firefighting protection, in advance of an outbreak of fire, seemed a logical precaution, especially in a crowded urban environment. Of course, this 'protection' was far from perfect, particularly in the rapidly urbanizing settings of the latter nineteenth century, but notice that Hirschfeld specifically references the development of firefighting services in the major cities of Western Europe from the early eighteenth century onwards. One can see his thought process in a particularly illuminating (if lengthy) sentence:[49]

les *fabri*, les *centonarii* et les *dendrophori* a maintes fois été souligné, et le point commun qui unissait ces trois collèges était leur rôle de pompiers.'

[47] Boscolo 2002, 94–95.

[48] Lafer 2001, especially 45–61.

[49] Hirschfeld 1884, 256.

> Wenn man bedenkt, wie spät in unserer Zeit selbst in großen Städten es als Pflicht der Kommune erkannt worden ist, durch Organisation einer stehenden, festbesoldeten Feuerwehr die Sicherheit des Lebens und des Eigentums der Einwohner zu schützen, und wie wenig entwickelt bis vor wenigen Dezennien das Institut der freiwilligen Feuerwehren in kleineren Orten und auf dem flachen Lande war, so wird man zugestehen müssen, daß auch in dieser, wie in so mancher anderer Hinsicht (ich erinnere nur an die großartigen Alimentarstiftungen Nervas und der späteren Kaiser in Italien) die römische Kaiserzeit Einrichtungen aufzuweisen hat, die bis auf unsere Zeit kaum erreicht, geschweige denn übertroffen worden sind.

> When one considers how late in our own [modern] time, even in large cities, it has been acknowledged, as a duty for the community, to guard the safety of the life and property of the populace through the orgnization of a standing, salaried fire department, and how little development has occurred since the early decades of the century, when volunteer fire services were made available in smaller towns and rural areas, he would have to recognize that, also in this respect, as in so many others (I recall to attention only the magnificent alimentary foundation of Nerva and the later Caesars in Italy), Imperial Rome has exhibited arrangements that have hardly been matched, much less surpassed, in our own time.

In other words, surely a civilization as advanced, forward-thinking, and rational as Rome's should still serve as a model for our own society. It can certainly be no coincidence that Hirschfeld was writing in a period of rapid societal change, as a climate of social progress was animating a number of governmental initiatives throughout Europe.[50] What, after all, made the alimentary scheme 'magnificent', other than its demonstration of official concern for the sustenance of the poor? Why was the imperial government providing a sensible, and socially just, protection to its citizens, even outside the Empire's major capitals? Inspired by questions like these, Hirschfeld appears to have proposed a level of far-sightedness among the Romans, which could be contrasted so usefully with the lack of it in modern times. Against this rather uplifting message, it might also have been the case that, as a friend cautioned me when I launched my own study of these supposed provincial firemen, the Romans were as a rule better at setting fires than at putting them out.

---

[50] For the effects of this climate on J.-P. Waltzing, see Chapter 2.

Accordingly, it seems to me that the reasoning according to which scholars have posited certain conclusions is generally more illuminating than the conclusions themselves. And in this connection, the historical, ideological, and even personal, context of the individual scholar surely plays a significant role. I began studying the *collegia* in order to delve into the mindset and priorities of those less-privileged people who rarely appear in our more familiar sources. Now, frankly, I despair of ever understanding the *collegia* in their full complexity, given the nature of our evidence and the frustratingly inadequate information that even several hundred texts can furnish. What became more intriguing to me as I wrote my dissertation (on the 'funerary colleges') was the number of treatises on the subject that were produced in Italy over the course of the 1930s. As an ancient historian, I was, of course, completely unaware of why this should have been the case. Nonetheless, I later decided, in order to satisfy my curiosity on the point, to walk up this dimly-lit alley-way. This book is the result of that deviation, one that has continued to lead me into some very dark corners of the recent European past.

Plan of the Book

The study is arranged chronologically, to highlight the main achievements of scholarly research on this topic, while taking into account the influence of contemporary ideologies, disputes, and agendas upon their thinking. The first chapter is an in-depth examination of the first published work of Theodor Mommsen (perhaps the most renowned ancient historian of recent centuries and the recipient of the second Nobel Prize for Literature), which explicitly addressed the Roman *collegia*. This Latin monograph, which appeared in 1843 while Mommsen was still a law student, contains the germ of the *C. I. L.* project, as well as the first attempt to systematize the inscriptional data attesting *collegia*. The chapter also explores how Mommsen's views of religion, of both the pagan and Christian varieties, shaped his perspective on the *collegia*, and how this perspective continues to influence thought on the subject. In this context, it concludes with an analysis of his dispute with Giovanni Battista De Rossi, founder of the science of 'Christian archaeology,' regarding the *collegia* and their putative connections to early Christian communities.

The following chapter explores the mise-en-scène of the four-

volume study that is still the basic reference work on Roman *collegia*, J.-P. Waltzing's *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains* (Louvain, 1895–1900). Waltzing was profoundly influenced by his surroundings (industrial Liège), and by his attachment to 'Christian Democracy', as he created this fundamental vision of ancient workingmen's associations. His assessment of Roman *collegia* as essentially benign social institutions produced a distorted view of lower-class life in the Empire, one that dominated discussion on the topic throughout the early twentieth century.

The next three chapters can be evaluated as an organic whole, developing not only the many individual studies of *collegia* launched in Fascist Italy during the 1930s, but also their wider economic, political, and (especially) institutional context. Chapter 3 accounts for the sudden rise of interest and publication on the subject in Italian universities in the second decade of Fascist rule, and places this against the backdrop of Fascist economic theory as it was promulgated in the period. The evolving (and essentially specious) doctrine of '*Corporativismo*', as promoted by the regime, lay behind this renaissance, and the government established academic institutions for the explicit purpose of comparing past and present associations. The many, and deservedly forgotten, monographs of young scholars on the subject are explored, and the early career of Francesco Maria De Robertis—perhaps the most respected authority on the *collegia* in the twentieth century—is evaluated against this background. An early article on the subject (from 1934) and his first book (in 1938) are analyzed in detail.

Chapter 4 uncovers the institutional context in which 'Romanness' in general, and the *collegia* in particular, were discussed by scholars in Fascist Italy. A structural analysis of *Roma*, the official journal of the Institute of Roman Studies (1922–1944), reveals the extent to which corporative principles were integrated into collegial studies in the period. The chapter also underscores the early relationship between Giuseppe Bottai, Minister of National Education for the Fascist regime (1936–1943), and the Institute, especially with its founder, director, and guiding spirit, Carlo Galassi Paluzzi. It concludes with an analysis of the Institute's involvement in the *Mostra Augustea della Romanità* (1937–1938), the culmination of the 'Roman' program for the government, and its incorporation of the *collegia* model within it.

Chapter 5, '*Collegia*, Race, and Roman Heritage under Giuseppe Bottai', examines Bottai's 1939 treatise, *Dalla Corporazione romana alla*

Corporazione fascista, published under the auspices of the ISR, in the light of contemporaneous racial theory and its intersections with '*Romanità*' between 1938 and 1942. Drawing on archival records from the Istituto Nazionale di Studi Romani, it demonstrates the connections between this work and Bottai's responsibility for expelling Jews from Italian educational life—both, to his mind, justified in the name of 'Romanizing' Fascist Italy. The work is not, therefore, merely a historical curiosity from a failed regime. Rather, it marks a turning point in the history of the Fascist dictatorship, itself.

And, finally, the concluding chapter discusses the historical and intellectual trends that have acted upon Roman collegial studies since the end of the Second World War. As Marxist conceptions and paradigms began to rise to the fore, in many academic disciplines, classicists have addressed the 'social' aspect of the associative phenomenon in ever greater depth. While Marxist thought influenced some of these studies—though not to an overwhelming extent, even in Communist Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union—postwar analyses have moved beyond the juristic studies of their predecessors, to weigh the desire for 'sociability' among members of these ancient institutions. Thus, in spite of the precision and scholarly authority brought to bear on the subject since 1843, there is still a great deal of room for new investigation of the Roman *collegia*, taking into account their own desires and experiences, rather than merely official views of their behavior.

A brief conclusion considers two works, both published in 1939, in which the classical experience was adapted to a modern European context. Using these, one may begin to speculate concerning the results of the trend Waltzing was determined to resist, already in 1912: the gradual phasing-out of classics as a *sine qua non* for the 'properly educated' Western person. In short, one might ask, in the present moment, whether the obsolescence of classics in the Western curriculum is necessarily a thing to be regretted, given the checkered history of this particular field of study.

The 'Cultors' of Lanuvio

Today's world is, naturally, a very different one from that of 1816, when the most famous and revealing piece of evidence attesting the Roman *collegia* was unearthed. In the fall of that year, farmers in

Civitá-Lavigna (modern Lanuvio) turned up roughly 60 fragments of a marble inscription in the fields of the Frezza brothers.[51] The immediate surroundings, and the wider setting, of the inscription are unclear. At the time, it was determined, upon further excavation and due principally to the terracotta tubes that had been found in its vicinity, that the inscription had been attached to a wall in a public bath.[52] However, an alternative account claimed that the site was originally along the Via Appia-Lanuvina, and very close to the town's cemetery.[53] Nevertheless, both versions agreed that the individual fragments had been 'diligentemente riuniti' into a square frame and stored in the Frezzas' home.[54] Nicola Ratti examined the stone there in 1824, and he published its contents in the (recently founded) *Dissertazioni della pontificia accademia romana di archeologia*.[55]

The inscription purports to be the by-laws of a '*collegium salutare Dianae et Antinoi*',[56] approved by those members assembled on 9 June 136 CE. The '*cultors*' of the society 'unanimously voted' that the initiation fee for the club would be 100 *sesterces*, plus an amphora of 'good' wine, and that monthly dues would be assessed at 5 *asses*.

---

[51] The family was a prominent one in the area, and the name is frequently attested in a genealogical record at http://www.peg.it/Lampe/radici/olivieri/stat2.htm.

[52] Commentary for *C. I. L.* 14.2112, pp. 196–197, quoting Ratti, 'Il luogo, dove fu ritrovato il marmo, è una camera appartenuta già ad un pubblico bagno, non facendone dubitare i tubi di terra cotta pur ivi rinvenuti, . . .'; see also Raggi 1879, 188: 'Esso fu trovato in più pezzi in una camera di un pubblico bagno, come par certo dai tubi di terra cotta, da un vicino foro che vi è tuttavia e dalle due spranghe di ferro con loro chiodi in un avanzo di muro della stessa camera.'

[53] Tomassetti 1882, 4: 'Al diligentissimo Nibby sfuggì la più importante di tutte le lapidi lanuvine; quella cioè rinvenuta nell'anno 1816, non presso le terme come alcuni hanno scritto, ma presso la suddetta via Appia-lanuvina, in sito spettante ai sigg. fratelli Frezza, nella cui casa tuttora si custodisce'; Chiarucci 1983, 81: '. . . rinvenuta a NE di Lanuvio nel 1816, probabilmente nel complesso archeologico posto al di sotto della strada provinciale via Laviniense, vicino al Cimitero comunale, ex Oliveto Frezza.'

[54] Gordon [1964, 2, 61] examined the inscription 'in January 1949, December 1955, and January 1956, lying in its wooden frame against a wall of the Antiquario of the Mus. Naz. Rom. (inv. no. 1031), where it was by 1898.' It can be viewed today in the Epigraphic Collection of the Museo Nazionale Romano, at the Baths of Diocletian. The pieces have been assembled and attached to a wall in the museum.

[55] Ratti 1825.

[56] Gordon suggested that the connection with Antinous was probably a result of fortuitous timing. Noting that there does not seem to have been a physical temple of Antinous in Lanuvium, he argued (Gordon 1938, 44–46): 'It looks as though the society, happening to be founded soon after the death of Hadrian's favorite, had taken as its "patron saints" not only Diana, who . . . was often thus honored, but Antinous as well. . . .'

Upon death, if the member was paid-up and in good standing, his heirs would receive 250 *sesterces*, to be used in the provision of the elements of an appropriate funeral. The by-laws went on to specify what would happen in the cases of death more than 20 miles distant from Lanuvium, intestacy, slave status, and suicide, but a sizeable portion of the document also deals with proper conduct at the college's banquets and celebrations. For example, any member who made too much noise when moving from one place to another would be fined four *sesterces*, anyone who spoke abusively or caused a disturbance at dinner would be fined 12, and anyone who verbally assaulted a '*quinquennalis*' of the club would be fined 20.

Despite the inherent interest of this sort of material, Ratti was most fascinated by the portion of the text headed, '*KAPUT EX S. C. P. R.*,' at the eleventh line of the text on its left-hand side. In a passage peppered with exclamation points, he observed that, as it was labeled 'the' *kaput* of a *senatusconsultum*, the clause must be 'il capo principale e di ogna cosa il principio ed il fondamento!'[57] In 1835, this paragraph was excerpted by Clemente Cardinali for his collection of 'imperial privileges', a book in which the young law student Theodor Mommsen found 'many useful things.'[58] Intrigued by the text, Mommsen composed a treatise on the theme *De collegiis et sodaliciis Romanorum, accedit inscriptio lanuvina*, and when it was published in 1843, a fold-out drawing of this new inscription was appended to its back cover. Appropriate to his studies at the time,[59] Mommsen dealt only with the legal standing of the *collegia* vis-à-vis the government, and not with the intriguing social relations implied in this remarkable document. The original pieces of the inscription had lain in the fields for several centuries before they were brought to light, and, in similar fashion, these other elements would have to wait a very long time to be analyzed in detail by Mommsen's successors in the field.

---

[57] Quoted in Mommsen 1843, 81, n. 12, and introduced with (a slightly dismissive?) 'Lepide Ratti ita restituit: . . .'

[58] Mommsen 1843, 81: 'Quod multo certiori ratione efficitur ex inscriptione, non multis nota, de qua plura dicenda sunt; posita est enim in libro in his terris rarissimo, cui titulus est: *Diplomi imperiali di privilegj accordati ai militari raccolti e comentati da Cl. Cardinali* (Velletri 1835.4). Repperi in eo inter alia multa et utilissima legem collegii alicuius, quod dicitur cultorum Dianae et Antinoi, integram paene servatam et meis usibus quasi paratam.'

[59] On the character of Mommsen's legal studies at Kiel, and their wider applications, see Whitman 1990, 216–217.

CHAPTER ONE

THEODOR MOMMSEN'S '*COLLEGIA FUNERATICIA*' AND THE SEARCH FOR CHRISTIAN ORIGINS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

In the spring of 1843, the 25-year-old son of a Lutheran pastor nervously awaited the results of his juristic examinations, published both a scholarly treatise and a book of original poetry, and also managed to make the rounds of the taverns of Lübeck. On 12 May, he was staying with his family at Husum, in the then-Danish duchy of Holstein, and his bags were packed for his new job at Altona, where he would be teaching girls in a school directed by his aunts. He would soon receive an 'ersten Charakter' on his exams,[1] and the certificate was dated 11 May, at Kiel.[2] However, in a letter to his friend Theodor Storm dated 12 May, he attempted to explain why he had chosen to take on a career like this at this uncertain point in his life. Realizing it was not exactly the position either he or Storm would have expected, he wrote, 'You will ask, what am I doing in Altona then? I will be a teacher of girls, my dear fellow! a brilliant prospect, don't you think?' Nevertheless, he believed this interlude would serve him well, as 'I want to be independent, on my own, away from my nearest relations, and here I have independence of a sort, which leaves me very much free to work—or to loaf about as I please.'[3]

Storm, who would become one of the most revered German poets of the nineteenth century,[4] replied on 14 May that the young teacher

[1] Hartmann 1908, 11.

[2] Wickert 1959–1980, I, 180.

[3] Teitge 1966, 66–67: 'Uebermorgen reise ich nach Altona, Alles steht um mich herum gepackt und emballirt; Sie werden sich also nicht verwundern, daß ich nur wenige Worte Ihnen schreibe, zumal da wir uns so bald sehen. Ich bleibe diesen ganzen Sommer jedenfalls in Altona, wir werden uns also dort sehen und unsre Fata austauschen können. Sie werden fragen, was ich denn in Altona treibe? Ich werde Mädchenlehrer, Bester! eine brillante Aussicht, nicht wahr? Indeß ist mir sehr damit gedient. Ich bin gern unabhängig, selbst von meinen Nächsten, und hier habe ich Unabhängigkeit auf eine Weise, die es mir freiläßt, so viel zu arbeiten oder zu bummeln wie ich will.'

[4] Among many other biographies, see Laage 1999.

should enjoy himself, but beware of becoming too enamored of his new life. Luckily for ancient historians of his own and all subsequent generations, Theodor Mommsen did not do so. In fact, in his magisterial biography of Mommsen, Lothar Wickert found it difficult to explain why he had agreed to fill such a post, suggesting that his resolution would have been foolish, had he not already determined the course of his life's work.[5] Nonetheless, Storm thought he understood why Mommsen had chosen this summertime diversion from 'serious' scholarship, an experience that differed so much from his own internship in a dreary law office. Storm inserted, in his letter of 24 May, a small poem on his friend's daily chores, which reads:[6]

Die Welt ist voll von Sommerlüften,
Und ich playdire im Gericht;
In Actenstaub und Moderdüften
Versinkt das liebe Sonnenlicht.

So scheidet mich allaugenblicklich
Mein Amt aus dieser Sommerzeit—
Nicht jeder ist, mein Freund, so glücklich
Wie Sie in seiner Thätigkeit.

Wenn Sie in Bummelsehnsuchtsstillung
Sich wärmen nicht im Sonnenlicht,
So schaun Sie als Berufserfüllung
Den schmucken Dirnen ins Gesicht.

* * *

The world is full with summer breezes,
And I hold forth in a courtroom,
In document dust and moldy vapors
Sinks the dear sunlight.

So divides me all of a sudden
My office from this summertime—
Not everyone, my friend, is
So happy as you in his occupation.

[5] Wickert 1959–1980, I, 181: 'Die Spannung, mit der er auf den Entscheid des Examenskollegiums wartete, wird zum Teil Ihren Grund darin haben, daß er gewissermaßen von ihm das Ja zu seinen Plänen erhoffte, das Nein fürchtete. Der Entschluß, eine Zeitlang im Tanteninstitut die Mädchen zu unterrichten, wäre töricht gewesen, hätte Mommsen nicht bereits die feste Absicht gehabt, auf die normale Amtslaufbahn zu verzichten. . . .'

[6] Teitge 1966, 69–70.

When you are gratifying your urge to take a stroll,
You do not warm yourself in the sunlight,
But look upon, as career fulfillment,
The cute girls' faces beaming back at you.

Everything was not happiness and warmth in this summertime idyll, however. Mommsen later complained that the wheels of his school were constantly grinding, as in a mill, and there were only seven days in a week, with three times that number of young protégées to tend.[7] His mother had congratulated him on his remarkable success on his exams on 15 May,[8] and he was mulling over his future—and not with the single-minded determination Wickert seems to have envisioned. In fact, he had time, in early June, to travel to Lübeck with relatives, while also making a series of 'visits' to local pubs. In another letter to Storm, he observed that, while sojourning in these places, 'Had I been holding on to a quill, and not to a steel pen, you would, to be sure, have received longer letters, but, for sensitive souls, these "institutes" are real lightning rods.' Concluding the letter with a flourish, he added, 'Therefore, for now—ergo bibamus.' After signing his name, though, Mommsen appended a brief statement in a wide, sprawling hand, to the effect that, 'You won't believe how drunk I am. This news will have to suffice for you.'[9]

It is, at the distance of a century and a half, extremely difficult to picture Mommsen as a young man, and even more difficult to

[7] Teitge 1966, 72: 'In dem unruhigen Treiben, daß in dieser Mädchenpension einmal herrscht, ist mein Brief wieder liegengeblieben, er sollte gleich auf die Post. Aber es ist, wie wenn man in ein Mühlwerk geräth, man wird mit umgetrieben, die Räder stehen nicht still, der Tage sind nur sieben und der Mädchen wohl dreimal soviel.'

[8] *Briefe aus dem Elternhause* 1917, 118, a letter from Frau Mommsen dated 15. Mai 1843: 'Möge Deine Karriere denn nun künftig ebenso glücklich sein, als sie bisher war; wenigstens steht Dir nun jeder juristische Weg offen; bei einem so schönen Charakter hast Du ja nur zu wählen, welchen Weg Du einschlagen willst.'

[9] Teitge 1966, 71: 'Ich vertreibe mir so die Zeit, bis ich mit meiner theuren jetzt auf unendlichen Visiten begriffenen Gens zum Rathskeller steigen kann; hätte ich eine Pose und keine Stahlfeder erhalten, so würden Sie wohl längere Episteln erhalten, aber für empfängliche Gemüther sind diese Institute wahre Blitzableiter. Für diesmal also—ergo bibamus. Jens Th. M. Sie glauben nicht, wie besoffen ich bin. Diese Annonce muß Ihnen genügen.' Due to the kind permission of Dr. Kornelia Küchmeister of the Schleswig-Holsteinische Landesbibliothek in Kiel, I was privileged to see the original manuscript of this letter, which is held in its archives together with a portion of the Storm-Mommsen correspondence. (In his edition of the documents, Teitge did not comment on the style of Mommsen's handwriting in this postscriptum.)

imagine his doubt and uncertainty at the verge of one of the most luminous scholarly careers in the entire history of *Altertumswissenschaft*.[10] Nevertheless, his letters to Storm and his poetry hint at his ambivalence about scholarship itself, despite the success of his initial forays in the field. Questioning the basis of legal studies, he groused about the 'hundreds of threads and fibers to disentangle' and 'the eternal hair-splittings and sharp readings' that 'dry up the fresh sources.'[11] Earlier in 1843, he had, together with Storm and his brother, Tycho Mommsen, composed a series of poems for a collection entitled *Liederbuch dreier Freunde*, and one might be surprised to learn that it was Theodor Mommsen, and not Storm, who was the featured poet of the three. As each poem is attributed to one of the 'three friends', it is clear that Theodor contributed more than half of the poems (62 of the 116), as well as the introductory piece in the set.[12] One of the best is a meditation on the professors he had known, as well as on the rambunctious student life of the period:[13]

Der Liedertafel

Es rauscht der Fluß, es braus't der Wind,
Und weil wir denn zusammen sind,
So woll'n auch wir eins singen.
Hier schallt es laut, hier klingt es gut,
Und wenn die Decke springen thut,
So laßt die Decke springen.

---

[10] Throughout 2002 and 2003, the back-to-back centennials of Mommsen's Nobel Prize for Literature (he was the first German—and remains the only ancient historian—to have received that award) and death were marked by many institutions. The Universität Kiel has been particularly active in these commemorations, and I am grateful to Dr T. Hill for drawing its ongoing project ('Mommsen—der erste deutsche Literaturnobelpreisträger' at http://www.uni-kiel.de/hip/projekte/mommsen/) to my attention, when I was in Kiel. Mommsen's childhood home in Garding (Schleswig-Holstein) was also opened to the public, and a large photographic exhibit was available to view there, in 2002.

[11] Teitge 1966, 72: 'Ich habe es wirklich ernsthaft gemeint mit der Jurisprudenz, aber wenn man so lange und so eindringl[ich] sich mit ihr beschäftigt, so ist es, als ob sie einen mit hundert und aber hundert Fäden und Fasern einschlänge, und über dem ewigen Haarspalten und Scharfsinn werden Einem alle frischen Quellen versiegen.'

[12] Mommsen (Th.), Storm, and Mommsen (T.) 1843, III–VI.

[13] Mommsen (Th.), Storm, and Mommsen (T.) 1843, 44. A well-known German jazz singer, Knut Kiesewetter, had adapted this poem to music, and recorded it with guitar accompaniment. This charming song may be heard at: http://www.garding.de/mommsen/storm/main.htm.

O hört, wie's aus den Ecken schallt!
Die Erd', ihr Herrn, ist noch nicht alt,
Und wir sind noch nicht zünftig!
Die Thorheit will sich Zeit fürwahr,
Die Welt ist kaum sechstausend Jahr
Und noch höchst unvernünftig.

Und weil die Welt doch gar zu dumm,
Lesen ihr die Herrn Kollegium,
Doch das ist rein verloren!
Heut' Abend herrscht der Spuz nun doch,
Die Tollheit hoch! und aber hoch!
Ihr Herren Professoren!

* * *

Murmurs the river, roars the wind,
And because we are together then,
We want to sing one.
Here it sounds loud, here it clangs well,
And when the ceiling gets to bursting,
Let the ceiling burst.

O hear, how it sounds from the corners!
The earth, gentlemen, is not yet old,
And we are not yet incorporated!
Foolishness will get older by itself,
The world has been around hardly 6000 years,
And is still irrational in the extreme.

And because the world is still too dumb,
Teach it, you masters of the collegium,
Yet even this is purely a waste!
In spite of that, tonight the froth rules,
Madness is high! And high indeed!
Here's to you, you gentlemen professors!

Mommsen's father had warned him about publishing verses like this, as he feared it would endanger his chances of success in the University.[14] However, Jens Mommsen need not have worried about his

[14] *Briefe aus dem Elternhause* 1917, 104–105: 'Vater an Theodor, Oldesloe, 7. Februar 1843, 6 ½ Uhr,' 'Was Deine gedruckte Abhandlung und Dein politisches Gedicht betrifft, so sind Mutter und ich fest überzeugt, daß Du dich selbst am sichersten stellst, wenn Du die gedruckte Abhandlung nicht zum Examen einreichst und Dein politisches Lied nicht drucken läßt. Durch das Gegenteil, durch die Einreichung Deiner gedruckten Abhandlung an die Examinatoren und durch die Veröffentlichung Deines politischen Glaubenbekenntnisses kannst Du Dir nur schaden, weil man Dir, unseres Erachtens, solche Schritte nur als Anmaßung anrechnen wird.'

son's prospects. In this year, Theodor published a work of lasting importance in his field, and he would go on to defend his dissertation, *summa cum laude*, on 8 November 1843.[15] The earlier work, entitled *De collegiis et sodaliciis Romanorum*, was the first major analysis of the *collegia* by a modern scholar,[16] and one of its aims was, as noted above, to publicize the Lanuvian inscription and describe the circumstances of its creation. Moreover, this work contains the germ of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (C. I. L.)* project, one of the most significant landmarks of classical scholarship in the past two centuries.[17] In the process, Mommsen had not only created, *ex nihilo*, a new field of study, but he would also soon provide the tool that made further refinement of that field possible. While this is a remarkable achievement, by any measure, it is also critical to understand the role that Mommsen's environment and basic philosophy played in the initial shaping of this new field. By examining his statements on the *collegia* in the 1840s and 1850s, as well as his later comments on the topic, one can assess how his unique personality played a crucial part in the development of collegial studies. In fact, his analysis—bearing the imprint of his personal feelings on the subject—has continued to influence the scholarship on *collegia*, right up to the present day.

Drawing on Mommsen's correspondence over this period, it seems clear that the *De collegiis* appeared in print in late March or early April 1843. In a letter of 5 January, he informed his mentor Otto Jahn[18] that one of his advisors at the Universität Kiel, Professor Osenbrüggen, had arranged for the treatise to be published by a local printer, and that it would be available sometime near Easter.[19] On 24 April, Jahn reported that he had read and taken great pleasure in the book. It is not difficult to understand why. In spare, elegant Latin, Mommsen established the parameters for his survey of the *collegia*, and he set out, in an afterword, to deflect any potential criticism of his method. He had purposely limited himself to commenting '*de jure collegiorum*' (on their legal status) and not '*de forma*'

---

[15] Hartmann 1908, 11.

[16] The treatise appears as the fourth entry in Zangemeister, Jacobs, and Rebenich 2000, 1.

[17] For a recent appreciation of his work, see Alföldy 2004.

[18] On Jahn, see Müller (C.W.) 1990; Müller (C.W.) 1991; and Calder, Cancik, and Kytzler 1991.

[19] Wickert 1962, 1–2. (Easter Sunday in 1843 was 16 April.)

(on their magistrates, internal structures, and activities), for three reasons. First, the field is too broad, he claimed, and the roots of the '*res sodaliciaria*' are too entrenched within Roman society to be pried out very easily.[20] Accordingly, the official sanctioning of the *collegia* was, he judged, the most straightforward and best-documented aspect of the matter. Moreover, he listed a number of contemporary scholars who were already working '*de forma collegiorum*', and he saw no need to duplicate their work here.

The final point is the most significant, and the most revealing, as it anticipates the course of his career over the next several decades. It is impossible, he insists, to document the inner workings of the *collegia* without a complete, published corpus of inscriptions. This is a desideratum because, '*Forma collegiorum brevius ac plenius explicabitur, si res collegiaria in corpore inscriptionum Romanarum ita tractabitur, ut Boeckhius in Graecis facere solet*' (129). This '*corpus*' would be Mommsen's goal when he launched the *C. I. L.* project in 1847, with a grant from his sovereign, King Christian VIII of Denmark.[21] As the situation stood in 1843, however, Mommsen was forced to rely upon the *Digest* and the *Codex Theodosianus*, some stray literary references, and a few inscriptions that were published more, or less, accurately. The absence of a reliable text and appropriate commentary was particularly troubling in the case of the Lanuvian inscription. This 'kaput of the SC' is quoted between lines 11 and 13 in the left-hand column of text, but, unfortunately, the left edge of the stone is missing at this point. Thus, it is impossible to determine either the number of letters lost from each line or how the actual 'section' began.[22] On the stone, one can read only:[23]

[20] Mommsen 1843, 128: 'Ea enim natura est rei sodaliciariae, ut perpetuam interpretationem vix recipiat; ita radices egit in totam rem Romanam.' In tribute, this sentence is quoted on the opening pages of both Liebenam 1890 and Ausbüttel 1982. [These books are described in detail below, Chapters 2 and 6, respectively.]

[21] In a letter of 28 February 1843, published in *Briefe aus dem Elternhause* 1917 (108–109), Mommsen's father gave him a template, for a letter to this King.

[22] Subsequent line-lengths may furnish clues to the number of missing letters, but this *kaput*—an unusual element in the much longer text—may have been indented differently. The phrase '*kaput ex s.c.p.r.*,' at least, appears deliberately to have been set off, and it was indented at least 5 spaces.

[23] For publication of the text, see especially Gordon 1964, II, 63 (#196), with Plates 87 and 88.

KAPUT·EX·S·C·P·R
-]NVENIRE·COLLEGIUMQ·HABERELICEAT·QUI·STIPEM·MENSTRUAM·CONFERRE·VO
-]A·IN·II·COLLEGIUM COEANT·NEQ· SUB SPECIE EIUS·COLLEGI·NISI·SEMEL IN MEN
-]FERENDI·CAUSA·UNDE DEFUNCTI·SEPELIANTUR

Even in its incomplete state, Mommsen noticed a similarity of language between this section and a paragraph in Book 47 of the *Digest*:[24]

> 47.22.1.1: Marcianus libro tertio institutionum. Mandatis principalibus praecipitur praesidibus provinciarum, ne patiantur esse collegia sodalicia neve milites collegia in castris habeant. *Sed permittitur tenuioribus stipem menstruam conferre, dum tamen semel in mense coeant, ne sub praetextu huiusmodi illicitum collegium coeat.* Quod non tantum in urbe, sed in Italia et in provinciis locum habere divus quoque Severus rescripsit. *Sed religionis causa coire non prohibentur, dum tamen per hoc non fiat contra senatus consultum, quo illicita collegia arcentur.*

To Mommsen's mind, this striking affinity of language indicated an affinity of subject-matter. Marcian's stated exemption for the '*collegia tenuiorum*' must have been related, in some way, to the SC quoted by the Lanuvians. In an astonishing bit of deduction, Mommsen thus correlated two obscure pieces of evidence addressing the status of 'licit' colleges. His reasoning seems all the more remarkable when one considers two further points. The members of the Lanuvian college never, in the body of a rather long inscription, actually call themselves '*tenuiores*,' nor does Marcian, in any sense, specify the 'sepulchral' (or any other) responsibilities of licit *collegia*. Simply on the basis of words shared in common, Mommsen could argue that the so-called *cultores Dianae et Antinoi* had claimed a legal exemption *as* a *collegium tenuiorum*.[25]

The corollaries of this conclusion seemed logical. The '*collegia tenuiorum*' must have been a category of associations permitted by law, of which the Lanuvian college was one manifestation. But, as the Lanuvian college was also the only known '*collegium tenuiorum*'—at least in 1843—the *collegia tenuiorum* were, *as a category*, '*collegia funeraticia*', a term Mommsen coined specifically for this description.[26] In

[24] Mommsen and Krueger's text, as published in Mommsen and Krueger 1985, IV, 792–793. [Emphasis added.]

[25] Mommsen 1843, 87–88.

[26] Mommsen 1843, 89–90: 'Accedit quod generalis privilegii nullius mentio fit

other words, these groups were permitted to assemble simply *because* of what they did at their monthly meetings: collecting dues from living members to pay for the funerals of the dead. This critical segment of the *De collegiis* reads:[27]

> Denique ita factum videtur esse ut Marcianus non adderet, quem in usum menstrua pecunia conferretur; etsi enim lege scriptum erat de sola pecunia in rem funerariam conferenda, re ipsa ad multa et diversa collatio spectabat. Itaque re considerata de collegiis tenuiorum haec tenenda esse arbitror. . . . Deinde cum exciperentur collegia aliqua, generaliter sanxisse senatum, ut funerum causa coire liceret; plures causas probabiles non addidisse eum, ne ipse illam legem abrogaret. Quare quicquid communi collatione indigere videretur, non propriis collegiis ad hoc institutis, sed applicatione ad collegia funeraticia perfectum esse.
>
> And finally therefore it seems to be the case that Marcian did not add for what use the monthly money was being collected; for even if it had been stated in the law that the money was to be collected solely for funereal purpose, in actual fact the collection was available for many different things. And therefore, having considered the matter of the *collegia tenuiorum*, I argue that these things must be taken into account. . . . And then, although exceptions were made for some *collegia*, the Senate had generally decreed that it would be legal to assemble for the purpose of funerals; it did not add other approved reasons, lest this abrogate that law. Whereby, whatever seemed to need a common collection was accomplished not by applying to colleges founded specifically for this reason, but by applying to the *collegia funeraticia*.

Over the century and a half since the *De collegiis* appeared, then, the existence of a discrete category of *collegia funeraticia* has been assumed, virtually without question. The strength of Mommsen's reasoning—and, more likely, of his later reputation[28]—established 'funerary' *collegia* as a group distinct from others, which were essentially 'professional,' 'religious,' 'social,' 'familial,' etc. Nevertheless, it can be demonstrated that the reasoning according to which Mommsen compartmentalized *collegia* was, at bottom, erroneous. In the first place, the Lanuvian

---

neque a scriptoribus neque in lapidibus, si unum genus collegiorum funeraticiorum exceperis, quorum confirmationem in parte SCti nobis servata tenemus.'

[27] Mommsen 1843, 91.

[28] In the case of the 'Lex Lucerina', John Bodel has likewise demonstrated the danger of following a Mommsenian chain of reasoning too closely: 'In the past this has scarcely seemed necessary, since the authority of Mommsen's attribution, which beggared criticism, effectively precluded serious discussion of alternative possibilities' [Bodel 1994, 29].

inscription and the *Digest* passage are not in fact similar enough to justify Mommsen's conclusions. Furthermore, Mommsen had no way of determining whether any given college was 'funerary' or not, given the criteria he had furnished here. This is a significant finding for epigraphers and all others who use *C. I. L.*, for these criteria helped to determine the arrangement of both its individual texts and its indices. In this case, the nature of the evidence we possess will not allow for the existence of '*collegia funeraticia*', so-called, and the better approach to the topic is to catalog all instances of a college—of whatever type—acting in a funerary capacity.[29] Furthermore, an analysis of this subset of colleges calls into question the need to 'categorize' colleges at all, a notion owed, in great measure, to the exposition of the subject in the *De collegiis*.

It is only in the past two decades that Mommsen's categorization of the evidence has been questioned in detail,[30] but a few points are worthy of careful notice here. (And there are also a few very curious stories to be told, on this point.) Mommsen posited the existence of an '*SC de collegiis*,' a blanket provision regulating all colleges—originally in Rome, and then throughout Italy and the Empire—of which this inscribed '*kaput*' was merely a portion. This conclusion, together with the arguments for it, are stated as:

> Quod SCtum non privilegium fuit cultoribus Dianae concessum, sed caput ex generali illo quo cavebatur quibusnam collegiis coire liceret. Primum enim si cultores Dianae specialem permissionem impetrassent, totum SCtum recepissent, certe cui collegio licentia coeundi daretur non omisissent; sed neutrum factum est. Deinde mihi restitutio aliter confici non posse videtur nisi ita ut verba: *[Quibus co]nvenire collegiumque habere liceat* capitis inscriptionem faciamus (81).
>
> This Senatusconsultum was not a privilege that had been conceded to the cultors of Diana [alone], but rather a section from the general [SC] in which it was stipulated which colleges could legally assemble. For, in the first place, if the cultors of Diana had had success in obtaining a special permission, they would have received the entire Senatusconsultum, nor indeed would they have neglected to mention to which college the license of assembling had been granted, but neither of these

[29] For such an attempt, see Perry 1999.

[30] Ausbüttel (1982) made a significant contribution to scholarship on the matter by refuting Mommsen's argument. I attempted to strengthen his case with more evidence in my dissertation, Perry (1999), one of the points of which is developed below.

> was done. Accordingly, it seems to me that no restoration can be made unless we render the inscription of the section in these words: *[Quibus co]nvenire collegiumque habere liceat.*

The primary argument, *ex silentio*, is not only unconvincing, in itself, but it is also undermined by other inscriptional evidence, of whose existence, to be sure, Mommsen could not have known. There is a wide array of *collegia* who assert in inscriptions only that '*ex s[enatus] c[onsulto] c[oire] l[icet]*' for them to assemble, with no further explanation of the circumstances of the allowance.[31] Furthermore, there may have been a dossier of documents attached to, set alongside, or otherwise stored together with, this particular inscription. There is, therefore, no reason to assume that this is the only reference to a special and unique grant to this single group at Lanuvium. At this time, they may have thought it sufficient to quote only a single *kaput* of their SC, granted to them alone and familiar to all.

As for the second assertion, '[*quibus co*]' is by no means the 'only' possible restoration for line 11. In 1873, Max Cohn proposed an alternative reading, one that led him to a rather different conclusion about the document.[32] He suggested that the word '*KAPUT*' was not necessarily tied to '*EX S. C. P. R.*,' and the line might instead be read, '*KAPUT [/] EX S. C. P. R. [QUIPPE NOBIS CO]NVENIRE. . .*' As a result, the SC would have been 'nicht ein Kapitel des Senatsschlusses, sondern ein Eingang der Kopf zu dem Text der Statuten bezeichnet.'[33] While Cohn did not challenge Mommsen's concept of 'eine generelle Erlaubnis' for *collegia tenuiorum*, nor his identification of a specific category of funerary colleges, he did indicate the clear possibility of other restorations. His reading, separating *KAPUT* and *EX S. C. P. R.*, may seem problematic, but there is a considerable gap between these two elements on the stone, and '*LEXS*' is, some lines below, likewise set off with wide spacing.

---

31 Among many examples, see *C.I.L.* 6.4416 (for the 'symphoniaci'), 6.29691 (for 'dendrophori'), *L'Année Épigraphique* (1909) #215 ('fontani'), and *AÉ* (1935) #25 ('fabri tignuarii').

32 His *Zum römischen Vereinsrecht: Abhandlungen aus der Rechtsgeschichte* (Cohn 1873), dealing principally with the legal standing of *collegia*, was subsequently overshadowed by Waltzing (1895–1900). [Cohn later became a professor in Amsterdam, and he changed his name to 'Max Conrat' in 1882. Further, see a brief biography (in Dutch) at http://www.inghist.nl/Onderzoek/Projecten/BWN/lemmata/bwn3/cohn.

33 Cohn 1873, 145.

However, a strange incident in the subsequent history of the inscription bears directly on this problem. In an 1850 article for the *Zeitschrift für geschichtliche Rechtswissenschaft*,[34] Mommsen supplemented the text with a 'new' piece of evidence, to be placed precisely (and rather fortuitously) at this spot. Here, he claims that, in 1847, he had visited the casa Frezza (apparently for the first time),[35] accompanied by his friend Wilhelm Henzen.[36] According to him, they found, among a collection of small shattered pieces of the tablet, a few decipherable fragments.[37] With three of these fragments he confessed he could do nothing, although they seemed to be related to the document in some respect. However, he also discovered a piece that looked like:

Q V I B
L E N
S E C

This fragment 'appeared' to be the lost beginning of lines 11 through 13. The new, improved text, with Mommsen's restorations in brackets, would thus have read:

KAPUT·EX·S·C·P·R
QUIB[us coire co]NVENIRE . . . . VO
LEN[t in fune]RA . . . . IN MEN
SE C[oeant con]FERENDI CAUSA . . .

Mommsen was convinced that he had found a missing portion of the stone, and this more complete version is the text that was published as *C. I. L.* 14.2112. There, Mommsen's supplements are recorded, in italics, but this 'new' fragment, with its letters also in

[34] 'Römische Urkunden,' originally printed in *Zeitschrift für geschichtliche Rechtswissenschaft* 15 (1850) 287–371, reprinted in the *Gesammelte Schriften*, Berlin: Weidmann, 1907, III, 75–124 [Mommsen 1850].

[35] There is no mention of a visit to Lanuvium in his earlier *Tagebuch der französich-italienischen Reise, 1844–1845* (Mommsen [1976]), although he was in Rome for three months on this occasion.

[36] Wickert 1959–1980, II, 374, quotes a letter from a mutual friend of the pair, dated 15 April 1847: '. . . von hier machten sich die Epigraphen Mommsen und Henzen nach Civita Lavigna (alt Lanuvium) auf, wo sie arbeiten wollten. . . .'

[37] Mommsen 1850, III, 116: 'Von der in viele kleine Stücke zertrümmerten Tafel haben sich auch noch einige kleine Fragmente vorgefunden, die bei Ratti fehlen und die zum Theil sich an ihren Ort einfügen lassen.'

italics, appears as if it were actually part of the original stone(s). Dessau adds, in his commentary on the inscription, that he has rendered the letters in italics because, despite Mommsen's claims, he himself (three decades later) could not find the fragment as described in 1850.[38] While the overly-hasty reader would naturally assume that the printed text, including these 10 letters, is still reliable, it is an important point that, as Gordon has observed, no other epigrapher has since been able to find this particular fragment, which was presumably placed back among the 'shattered pieces' and promptly forgotten.[39] One might ask why Mommsen did not press Frezza or his heirs to attach the piece to the square frame, or at least to identify it as a fragment of the inscription. In any event, the restorations here need not be accurate, merely because they are Mommsen's. In a notorious case, Werner Eck discovered that Mommsen's reconstruction of 19 lines of the 'Testamentum Dasumii' was completely wrong, once the rest of that stone had been recovered.[40]

In sum, then, there is in the *Digest* passage no indication, nor even the merest hint of one, of why *tenuiores* formed colleges. On the other hand, the Lanuvian SC states that the dead are to be buried, certainly by this college, if not by others like it. A remarkable harmony of language had led Mommsen to identify these cultors with 'little people's colleges,' thereby supplying a purpose for their assembly and an agenda for their meetings. In the process, he had created, *ab origine*, a term which does not seem to have existed in antiquity—'*collegium funeraticium*'—and he had made it equivalent to '*collegium tenuiorum*.' His pride in this achievement is amply reflected in the *De collegiis*:[41]

> Nunc de collegiis funerariis propriam disputationem instituemus. Quem locum tam fuse a nobis tractari erunt qui mirentur; sed non omni die in rebus antiquis explicandis incidimus in rem integram, qualem hanc esse apparebit.

---

[38] Hermann Dessau, *C. I. L.* 1887, volume 14, page 196: 'Rattius non magis integram vidit quam ego; contra Mommsenus et Henzenus anno 1847 fragmenta nonnulla cum reliquis non coniuncta invenerunt, quae nec Rattius viderat neque ego nuper data opera inquirens in aedibus Frezza repperi. Pertinent ex his fragmentis alia ad col. I v. 11–16, ubi ea vides distincta litteris inclinatis. . . .'

[39] Gordon 1964, II, 66.

[40] Eck 1978. Referring to Eck's discovery, Edward Champlin remarked that this was, indeed, 'a sobering revelation' (Champlin 1986, 252).

[41] Mommsen 1843, 92.

> Now we shall begin a discussion germane specifically to the funerary colleges. Some will be surprised that we deal with this subject at such length; but it is not every day, in unfolding ancient matters, that we come upon a virgin territory, which this one will appear to be.

Nevertheless, Mommsen soon ran into difficulties in applying this entirely new category to individual colleges. He was certain, however, that at least one group of colleges, those whose members were called '*cultores*' of a god or gods, were essentially funerary in nature. Although they continued to meet under the name of a tutelar (and, presumably, titular) deity, all aspects of 'religious' service had drained away long before the Principate began. By the time of the putative '*SC de collegiis*,' their sphere of activity had shrunken to burying departed members. Mommsen makes this case, looking both to the remote past and to the world around him, for supporting evidence (92):

> Collegia Deo cuidam sacra frequentissime in lapidibus apparent, quae principaliter ad Deorum cultum spectavisse constare videbatur. . . . Dii illi tutelares collegiorum similes videntur fuisse Sanctis, qui olim apud nostrates collegiis nomina dare solebant, etsi illa ad longe alias res constituta erant quam ut bonum Nicolaum Martinumve colerent.

> Collegia consecrated to a certain God appear very frequently on the stones, which seem to have existed principally to see to the worship of the Gods. . . . Those tutelar Gods of the colleges seem to have been similar to the Saints, who, among our countrymen a long time ago, were in the habit of giving their names to colleges, even if they had been established for far different purposes than to give service to the good St. Nicholas or St. Martin.

Thus, like modern societies of SS. Nicholas or Martin, the '*cultores deorum*' had also been established to perform acts of worship for their 'patron saints.' As time went on, however, they abandoned their ostensible purpose for assembly and moved on to other pursuits, dealing more with the human than with the divine realm. Naturally, one wonders whether Mommsen had any specific situation in mind when he wrote this. Was he thinking of the sodalities of these saints, in particular, or did he merely toss them out as representative examples?

That he should have thought of St. Nicholas, at least, is not surprising, given the prominence of this saint in Mommsen's native Schleswig-Holstein. There was an impressive Church of St. Nikolaus in Gettorf, only a few miles from Kiel, and churches consecrated to him were scattered along both coasts of the duchy. At each site,

'Nikolausgilde' were noticeably active, from the Late Middle Ages on, in charity work.[42] This was only to be expected from fraternities devoted to this saint, but the focus on human needs and charity toward one's fellow men is probably what Mommsen was emphasizing in this comparison.

The reference to St. Martin (of Tours, presumably) is more difficult to explain,[43] but his 'societies' appear elsewhere, in another nineteenth-century work on the Roman *collegia*. In an article for the *Revue des deux mondes*, composed in the aftermath of the Paris Commune, Gaston Boissier also compared the '*cultores deorum*' to the sodalities of this same saint, revealing the values of an increasingly 'sécularisé' age in the process. A revealing portion of this essay, entitled, 'Les associations ouvrières et charitables dans l'empire romain,' reads:[44]

> One would commit a ridiculous error, if he let himself be deceived by the old names that they retained, and if he took our societies of Saint Denis or of Saint Martin for some clutches of hermits. The saint is no more for them than a label that distinguishes them or the pretext for some joyous feasts. The Roman associations were on the way to the same thing, only they stopped en route. They never went so far toward becoming secularized as ours have; if their religious spirit weakened, they did, at least, preserve the customs and the cult.

Similarly, Cohn maintained that the Lanuvians had experienced a markedly 'secularizing' trend, 'als die religiösen Tendenzen in den Vereinen in den Hintergrund zu treten anfingen.'[45]

This trend of thought was already at work in Mommsen's day, and he clearly felt its influence. Despite the mild, Pietistic Lutheranism of his parents—so poignantly reflected in their letters to him—

---

[42] Schmidt 1978, II, 230.

[43] However, Martin was a prominent figure in Norman art during the Black Death, when 'apparaît-il comme l'exaltation de la vertu théologale de Charité' (Fournée 1978, 33).

[44] Boissier 1871, 629–630: 'On commettrait une erreur ridicule, si l'on se laissait tromper par les anciens noms qu'elles ont gardés, et si l'on prenait nos sociétés de Saint-Denis ou de Saint-Martin pour des réunions d'anarchorètes. Le saint n'est plus pour elles qu'une étiquette qui les distingue ou le prétexte de quelques joyeux festins. Les associations romaines ont pu suivre la même voie, seulement elles se sont arrêtées en route. Jamais elles n'en sont venues à se séculariser autant que les nôtres; si l'esprit religieux s'est affaibli chez elles, elles ont au moins conservé les pratiques et le culte.' See also Boissier 1872 (specifically on the *collegia funeraticia*) and Boissier 1884, II, 274–297.

[45] Cohn 1873, 140.

Mommsen made a sharp and permanent break with the faith of the 'Pfarrhaus' into which he had been born.[46] It is relatively easy to track Mommsen's early 'apostasy' from Christian belief (coming at the conclusion of a crisis of faith in 1836–1837, documented in an introspective series of poems),[47] and it is also easy to detect, throughout his scholarly work, a general distrust of the 'Zaubertrank der Spekulation' that seemed to inform overtly religious concepts and periods of intense religiosity.[48] In a nuanced and sophisticated portrait of the man, Stefan Rebenich has recently sketched out the parameters of the parsonage in which Mommsen grew up, and he comments at length on the formation of Mommsen's religious opinions. Upon analyzing the sermon notes of Jens Mommsen, one can detect a synthesis of Lutheran orthodoxy and Enlightened rationalism, suggesting that the Mommsens were quietly pious, and not stridently fundamentalist, in their Christian belief.[49]

However, as he began his education away from the Pfarrhaus, Theodor seems to have become increasingly dissatisfied with his parents' 'pietistische Frömmigkeit' and to have demanded more 'rational' answers to his questions about religion. For example, in struggling with the concept of Christ's divinity, a 19-year-old Mommsen wrote to his father, 'Now I ask you, dear father, you who hold tightly to the middle-path between Deism and Mysticism, in other words, the moderate orthodoxy, which definition is correct?'[50] The questions finally became too weighty, and Mommsen, together with his brothers, parted ways with the Christianity they had inherited from their parents. Their father was forced to accept the decision of his sons, 'though with a heavy heart' in Rebenich's phrase, but Mommsen's parents continued to incorporate Christian terms and wishes into

---

[46] Mommsen was, of course, not the only man of his background to have deposited his faith along the way. The most famous example is probably Friedrich Nietzsche, who was born to a Lutheran pastor in Saxony in 1844. Further, particularly on Nietzsche, Podak 1984. [I owe this reference to Professor Stefan Rebenich.]

[47] Wickert 1959–1980, I, 358–361.

[48] On Mommsen's religious and philosophical views, see especially Heuß 1956, 14–17.

[49] Rebenich 2002, 12: 'Kein Wort findet sich in seinen Aufzeichnungen über den Konflikt zwischen lutherischer Orthodoxie und aufgeklärtem Rationalismus sowie über die auch in Schleswig und Holstein schnell anwachsende Erweckungsbewegung, deren pietistische Frömmigkeit sich gegen die intellektuelle Vernunftreligion wandte und die ihren fundamentalistischen Biblizismus der modernen Schriftkritik entgegensetzte.'

[50] Cited in Wickert 1959–1980, I, 98.

their letters to Theodor.[51] Wickert provides a fascinating anecdote, as a window into this process, hinting that some of Mommsen's revulsion to intense expressions of Christian belief stemmed mainly from the sermon style of contemporary preachers. On Ascension Day 1837, Mommsen went to a church service with his brother, probably only to please their father, as this was a rare occurrence for them both. This was, he later recalled, the first and last time he wished to hear the preaching of this particular pastor. The theme of the sermon seems to have been that we Christians should make ourselves worthy of heaven by, first, working in love, second, striving in faith, and third, dying in hope. Such seemed a standard Lutheran message, but the preacher had tricked out his sermon with 'a stale mixture of tirades, repetitions, and rationalism such as, for example, a natural explanation of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.' The man's 'preaching was propped up by theatrical elements, alternating gentle whispering with thundering speech, and with pregnant pauses without sense and meaning. . . .'[52]

As is often the case, however, there was still a residue of Mommsen's 'Pfarrhaus' in his later life and career. He was, as Rebenich skillfully observes, still committed to Protestant confessional causes, when they conflicted with Catholicism,[53] and, perhaps even more importantly, his commitment to philology may have replaced his 'lost Christian faith.' In a generalized, but well-argued, study, Walter Rüegg has recently traced the nineteenth-century German 'Breakthrough in Classical Philology' to this deep cultural need. On the one hand, these scholars were drawn to the exemplary nature of classical antiquity, in which 'many of them found a substitute . . . for a lost Christian faith,' while also insisting on rigorous Quellenforschung, in order to discover the real lives of ancient people.[54] One might conclude, therefore, that Mommsen's various statements on religion were not merely objective statements of fact. They may also have satisfied a strong

[51] Rebenich 2002, 12; *Briefe aus dem Elternhause* 1917, 115, a letter of 18 April 1843 from Mommsen's father: 'Daß Euch, vielgeliebte Examinanden, unsere elterlichen Segenswünsche in höchstem Maße gewidmet und stets zugewandt sind, Dir besonders, guter Theodor, wegen des Charakters, brauche ich Euch nicht zu beteuern. Gott gebe, daß Ihr Euch nur immer, namentlich in dieser Zeit, recht wohl befindet und also auch heiter und wohlgemut in Euer gelehrtes *Scrutinium* hineingeht.'

[52] Wickert 1959–1980, I, 98–99.

[53] Rebenich 2002, 14, and see below, for his commentary on the 'Kulturkampf'.

[54] Rüegg 2004, 422–423.

psychological desire, as the lapsed pastor's son grappled with the implications of his 'apostasy', while also de-emphasizing the role religion played in the lives of the ancient Romans, to whom he looked for guidance. Accordingly, in this first treatise on the *collegia*, any 'religious' elements were relegated to a nominal position, and, even today, one rarely considers the vaguely 'sacral' prerogatives that may have motivated the formation of these organizations. In fact, this theme emerged in a conference I was privileged to attend at the University of Pennsylvania in 2003;[55] several of the participants noted that the 'religious' character of these organizations was often of singular, if not of paramount, importance, despite what modern commentators seem to have claimed about them.

Giovanni Battista De Rossi and the 'collegia funeraticia'

While this analysis may seem too deterministic, Mommsen's opinions on religion, in both the ancient and modern worlds, did have a profound influence on his writing about the Roman *collegia*. This was clear not only in the *De collegiis* itself, but also in his various reactions to a famous 'thesis' advocated by his friend and fellow epigraphist, Giovanni Battista De Rossi. Accordingly, the story of this complex interaction between two giants of classical scholarship is not merely intriguing as biographical narrative; rather, it demonstrates how individual personalities can and do shape scholarly opinion.

On the occasion of his sixtieth birthday, 78 scholars honored Mommsen with some 800 pages on a wide variety of subjects, touching on matters of philology, archaeology, history, epigraphy, numismatics, and law. Composed of contributions in German, Latin, Italian, English, and French, the *Commentationes philologae in honorem Theodori Mommseni, scripserunt amici* (1877) reflects both the breadth of Mommsen's own interests and the enormous influence he had exerted, on classical studies generally, some 25 years prior to his being awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature. Among these papers is a seven-page piece by De Rossi, the renowned epigraphist and founder of 'Christian archaeology,' entitled 'I collegii funeraticii famigliari e privati e le

[55] 'Ancient Religious Associations in Context', held at the University of Pennsylvania on 25 October 2003.

loro denominazioni.'[56] As he described it, this essay was designed to supplement a segment of his own great work, *La Roma sotterranea cristiana*, the third volume of which had been published at Rome in the same year. Underscoring the importance of both Mommsen's *De collegiis* and his labors on the *C. I. L.* project, De Rossi here chose to focus his remarks on a small set of inscriptions, offered by roughly a dozen enigmatic groups of people called '*Syncratii*,' '*Gaudentii*,' '*Eugenii*,' '*Eventii*,' et sim.[57] Adding two new texts to those already known, De Rossi attempted to determine to what extent these were 'familial' colleges, i.e., associations of the freed and enslaved members of a single household.

However, what is most interesting in this essay is what is missing from it: De Rossi's often-repeated hypothesis that, as the earliest Christian cemeteries reflect a strong connection with the familial colleges, Christian communities may deliberately have organized themselves on the model of these organizations, which were officially tolerated by the government. In order to understand this omission, one must take into account the very different personalities and opinions of these two friends, and the roles that these differences played in their evaluation of ancient evidence.

Rebenich and others have commented on the surprisingly warm affinity and high mutual regard De Rossi and Mommsen seem to have felt for each other, in both their professional and their personal collaborations. Especially in his study 'Giovanni Battista de Rossi und Theodor Mommsen,' but also in a piece entitled 'Theodor Mommsen und das Verhältnis von Alter Geschichte und Patristik' and in his one-volume biography,[58] Rebenich has established the dynamics of this relationship, which is well documented, not only in their correspondence with each other, but also—and perhaps more revealingly—in the comments both made to third parties. Although, on the occasion of De Rossi's death in 1894, Mommsen ultimately praised him as 'ein pflichttreuer Mann' and lamented, 'Rossis Platz

[56] De Rossi 1877. The dedication page of the volume reads 'Theodoro Mommseno natalicia sexagesima gratulantur amici LXXVIII,' but there is no indication of a specific editor of the volume. Among the contributors were Ernst Curtius, Wilhelm Henzen, Otto Hirschfeld, Rodolfo Lanciani, Otto Seeck, and Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (see 'Index Auctorum', 826–828).

[57] *C. I. L.* 6.10268–10285. See below (at n. 99) for Mommsen's comments on the collection, and his rationale for assembling them under a separate heading.

[58] Rebenich 1993; Rebenich 1995; Rebenich 2002.

in der Wissenschaft bleibt leer,'[59] Rebenich demonstrates that this favorable estimation was not always the case, especially when the two men first encountered each other at Rome in 1845.

The highs and lows of their relationship in the intervening decades were most often dictated by their very different views concerning religion in general, and Christianity in particular. In the discussions between the devout Catholic nobleman and the lapsed pastor's son one may hear echoes of the bitter exchanges between the village curé and the village atheist in *Madame Bovary*. As was the case with De Rossi and Mommsen, however, this priest ends by slapping the chemist on the shoulder, as both stand vigil over Emma's deathbed, declaring, 'Nous finirons par nous entendre!' The extent of this personal 'understanding' may have been deep and profound, but no one has yet drawn attention to how this debate, which was, of course, a common one among thoughtful Europeans in the nineteenth century, shaped the scholarly disagreements that periodically emerged between them. Nevertheless, by examining their dispute on a specific matter of epigraphy, we can see how personal feelings and theological musings created the terms of an essential debate regarding the *collegia*—and how the terms of that debate have continued to shape thinking on the subject, to this day.

Mommsen's initial impressions of De Rossi (who was 23 years of age, to Mommsen's 27)[60] are amply documented, both in Wickert's biography and in the published Jahn-Mommsen correspondence.[61] De Rossi first appears in Mommsen's letters as an unnamed 'scrittore' attached to the Vatican library, who was assisting Mommsen in his 'studj [sic] particolari.'[62] A subsequent letter to Jahn (dated 29 June 1845) identifies this *scrittore* as De Rossi, and it contains the first intimations of Mommsen's plan to involve him in the project of gathering inscriptions. Building on the end of the *De collegiis*, and on the strength of the stipend he had received from the crown of

[59] Mommsen, 'Giambattista [sic] de Rossi,' *Die Nation* 12, 2 (13. Oktober 1894) 19–20, reprinted in *Reden und Aufsätze* [Mommsen 1894, 465 and 467].

[60] Rebenich 1995, 173, lists his birthdate as '23. September 1822', but the correct date is 23 February. On De Rossi, see especially the extensive bibliography in Rebenich 1995, 173 n. 2, with the addition of Shahan 1895 and Baruffa 1994.

[61] Wickert 1962.

[62] Sections of the letter, dated 15 March 1845, appear in Wickert 1959–1980, 2, 96–97, and it is rendered, in full, in Wickert 1962, 15–17. De Rossi was appointed a 'scriptor' at the Vatican Library immediately after his graduation from the Sapienza (1840–1844), and he held this position for the rest of his life.

Denmark, Mommsen traveled to Italy, for both work and pleasure, as recorded (in equal measures) in the *Tagebuch* of his travels.[63] Reflecting on De Rossi's interest in Christian inscriptions and his presumed access to materials that might be denied to any other epigrapher, Mommsen asks, in the letter of 29 June, 'Wie wäre es, wenn wir uns mit ihm in Verbindung setzten, vielleicht ihm die *Christiana*, vor denen Ihnen gewiß auch graut, abträten?'[64]

Nonetheless, even in these early phases of their relationship, there are signs of a fundamental difference of outlook and intent between the two 'Mitarbeiter.' In the same letter, Mommsen says of De Rossi:[65]

> I take him for a man who wishes, through these literary studies—which are, naturally, most favored at the papal court—to obtain for himself a political career, which, as you know, is not such a rare thing here; I think that he is aiming to have his name attached to an enterprise that is certain to be considered something glorious here in Italy, at least so long as Italians are involved.

Despite this bit of (imagined?) Vatican intrigue, Mommsen wrote to Henzen, in April 1853, that De Rossi's attachment to the project had been, and was still, crucial to its going forward.[66] In this connection, De Rossi was especially valuable, as he worked without financial compensation and was on hand in Rome when the team desired access to Vatican archives. Mommsen spelled out the terms of the collaboration in a letter to De Rossi, dated 6 August 1853, and he laid particular stress on De Rossi's unique privileges in this regard.[67] However, there are indications that, despite his signal contributions, the Italian was something of an odd man out among these

63 Mommsen [1976].

64 Wickert 1962, 34–36, at 35.

65 Wickert 1962, 35: 'Ich halte ihn für einen Mann, der durch diese literarischen Studien—die natürlich am päpstlichen Hofe die am besten gelittenen sind—sich eine politische Karriere bereiten will, was, wie Sie wissen, hier nicht selten ist; mich dünkt er wird geneigt sein seinen Namen an eine Unternehmung zu attachieren die hier in Italien gewiß für glorreich gelten wird, wenigstens soweit Italiener beteiligt sind.'

66 Rebenich 1995, 179–180, with Anm. 35.

67 The original manuscript of this letter has been reproduced in Buonocore 1996 (308). See especially 'Point 3' in this list, '3. Va senza dire che i lavori preparatorj da ognuno si faranno per tutta la raccolta; e ne segue, che per esempio da' manoscritti Vaticani tutto ciò che spetta alle iscrizioni delle province e dell'alta e bassa Italia si avrà da estrarre e da mettere alla disposizione del redattore di questa parte. Fidiamo in lei [sic], che ci farà accessibili tutti i manoscritti delle biblioteche Romane.'

young Germans; Henzen complained to Mommsen, as early as August 1845: '. . . Ihr vermeintlicher Freund Rossi hat jeden Stoßseufzer, jedes quousque tandem pflichtschuldigst, wie es scheint, rapportiert, so daß die Herrn wütend über Sie sind.'[68] In his reply to Henzen from Naples, Mommsen announces his intention to come to the Vatican shortly, asking, playfully, 'Glauben Sie übrigens wirklich, daß man mich zurückweist?' It is, perhaps, a telling point that Wickert quotes only a few sentences of this particular letter, adding in a footnote, 'Die harten Worte Mommsens über de Rossi, die hier stehen, wiederholen wir um so weniger, als die beiden auch weiterhin freundschaftlich verbunden blieben; es wird also mit de Rossis Indiskretion so schlimm nicht gewesen sein.'[69]

In his article on De Rossi's and Mommsen's relationship, Rebenich chronicles these incidents, and then moves swiftly to considering the expressions of friendship between the two men, most often in the letters (generally in Italian) exchanged between them. Marco Buonocore has recently published some of the De Rossi-Mommsen correspondence, covering the period 1847–1893, and these letters do furnish evidence of a close personal friendship, as Mommsen often reflects on their past and present collaborations.[70] Moreover, Rebenich describes Mommsen's significant, though complex, role in the celebration of De Rossi's seventieth birthday in 1892,[71] and his lengthy encomium to him two years later. Accordingly, one gains the impres-

[68] Wickert 1959–1980, 2, 138.

[69] Wickert 1959–1980, 2, 305, Anm. 174.

[70] Buonocore 2003. For one example, see 6, n. 10, from a letter of 15 September 1881, as Mommsen reflects on their shared past: 'No, la nostra alleanza durerà tanto che duriamo noi, e se sono ben contento che gli anni futuri non possono essere tanti quanto i passati, credete pure che fra le poche memorie care e buone e durevoli conta l'amicizia formata fra lo scrittore della Vaticana ed il dottore "danese", che pure è divenuta utile anche alla nostra scienza.'

[71] Rebenich (1995, 185, with Anm. 73) cites a letter concerning the event from Louis Duchesne (1843–1922) to Mommsen, dated 26 April 1892, which includes the comment: 'Je suis venu ici [Rome] pour la béatification de s. Giambattista de Rossi. On a beaucoup regretté votre absence. Le saint se porte très bien, et, ce qui ne se voit pas dans les canonisations ordinaires, il a pris plusieurs fois la parole de façon à nous faire mieux apprécier ses titres aux honneurs divins.' Mommsen seems to have considered these 'canonization' proceedings exaggerated and distasteful. In a brief parenthesis in his obituary, which may be interpreted as commentary on the fête, and perhaps on Duchesne personally, he observes: 'Wie tief er [de Rossi], wie alle Italiener, die enge Verwandtschaft mit den Franzosen empfand und in wie überschwenglicher Weise er auch von diesen gefeiert ward . . .' [Mommsen 1894, 466].

sion that, despite their early, and perhaps mutual, bafflement with each other, the two created a warm and deep friendship, despite Mommsen's famous declaration that he was himself '*homo minime ecclesiasticus*.'[72] As Rebenich observes in his article on Mommsen and (particularly) Adolf von Harnack:[73]

> Die Freundschaften, die Mommsen mit katholischen Wissenschaftlern wie Duchesne und Giovanni Battista de Rossi pflegte, unterstreichen zugleich, daß er durchaus in der Lage war, seine religiösen und konfessionellen Vorurteile auf Grund persönlicher und wissenschaftlicher Wertschätzung aufzugeben.

Rebenich may be correct to draw attention to this 'understanding,' but one may also question whether Mommsen was, in fact, 'fully capable of setting aside his religious and denominational [i.e. Protestant] prejudices' on the basis of his personal and professional regard for a colleague. His fiery reaction to the 'Kulturkampf' crisis (the two major phases of which occurred between 1871 and 1887), in a letter to De Rossi, indicates that he would not be restrained by respect for his friend's Catholicism in a matter of such vital importance to his own country. In a revealing statement of 12 February 1881, he told De Rossi, while 'I respect, with every fiber of my heart, the faith that is not mine,' 'my own political faith is no less sacred than a religious faith.'[74] This sentiment was certain to displease his old friend, for, in his own correspondence at the time, De Rossi had expressed his strong sympathy for the Church's position, believing that 'the end of all of this will surely be the triumph of Christ and of his Church.'[75] Moreover, by examining the repeated references to De Rossi's opinions and personality in Mommsen's famous oration on 'Die Katakomben Roms,' delivered to the Berlin Unionsverein on 13 January 1871, as well as in his published obituary for De

---

[72] As cited in Rebenich 1995, 176, n. 14. Mommsen used this phrase in the foreword to his edition of the *Liber pontificalis* [Mommsen 1898, viii n. 1]. The phrase appears in a slightly different form in the actual text, and the full sentence helps to clarify its meaning: 'Mei labores quod non tam imperfecti evaserunt quam expectandum fuit in libro ecclesiastico ab homine minime ecclesiastico recensito, eo effectum est, quod eundem Harnackium in magnis minutisque perpetuo consulere potui.'

[73] Rebenich 1993, 147.

[74] Buonocore 2003, 192–193.

[75] This was a letter to Franz Xaver Kraus (1840–1901), a German Catholic who, himself, disagreed with the extreme position De Rossi had adopted. For the text, see Ferrua 1946.

Rossi, one might come to a very different conclusion on this point. The portrait of De Rossi is subtly, but compellingly, drawn: he was, in Mommsen's estimation, a genuine Christian believer, specifically in the pre-Nicaean mode, but it was only when De Rossi overcame the 'darkness' and 'superstition' inherent in that position that his opinions became 'scientific,' and thus worthy of consideration by the other 'scientists' of antiquity.

While much of the obituary stresses De Rossi's contributions to scholarship, particularly by means of his journal (the *Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana*, which first appeared in 1863) and his championing of the importance and systematization of the new fields of Christian archaeology and epigraphy, Mommsen also reflects on his friend's personal character. Beginning with the observation that he was 'ein *Romano di Roma*,' boasting important ecclesiastical and aristocratic connections, he comments, near its end: 'Der große Gelehrte war auch ein guter Mann.'[76] In the vivid image that follows, he comments on De Rossi's diplomatic accommodation with the new national government after the end of the Papal State in 1871:

> Als neben den Vatikan der Quirinal trat, blieb er selbstverständlich bei der alten Fahne; aber sein klarer Sinn und seine milde Natur ließen ihn in dem schweren Konflikt die zur Zeit allein möglichen Notbrücken finden und betreten.

For the purposes of his characterization, however, Mommsen may have exaggerated the 'mildness' of De Rossi's allegiance to the Papal 'colors.' At least in the hearing of Ferdinand Gregorovius, De Rossi, on two occasions in 1878, expressed himself in passionate and vehement terms on the subject of Church/State relations in Italy. In his entry for 9 March 1878, Gregorovius notes: 'Er [De Rossi] bekannte sich mit Entschiedenheit als Anhänger des Papsttums in allen seinen Ansprüchen, erklärte, daß er niemals der weltlichen Regierung als einer Usurpation den Schwur leisten werde. . . .'[77]

Both Mommsen and Gregorovius traced De Rossi's interest in Christian archaeology to his early youth, alluding to what must have

---

[76] Mommsen 1894, 462 and 467.

[77] Gregorovius [1991], 398. Gregorovius notes a similar conversation with De Rossi at another dinner (offered at the same renowned salon, of Donna Ersilia Caetani) on 10 February 1878 (386). Donna Ersilia was famous for inviting scholars, artists, and dignitaries of all political persuasions, and Mommsen seems to have entertained the possibility of inviting her to participate in the compilation of one of the volumes of *C. I. L.* (See Bartoccini 1997 and Buonocore 2003, 138, n. 396.)

been a familiar story in De Rossi's circle. Mommsen observed, '[er] wendete sich in frühester Jugend der Katakombenforschung zu, die völlig nie geruht hatte,' and Gregorovius claimed, already in 1858: 'Er ist der größte Gelehrte in Rom, in den Katakomben gleichsam aufgewachsen und von staunenswertem Wissen in der christlichen Archäologie.'[78] In this vein, Mommsen went on to describe the impromptu tours De Rossi gave to curious visitors, and focuses particularly on the effect of his speeches in these dark and hushed precincts:[79]

> ein enthusiastischer Zug ging durch seine Rede, der all die vielen, die ihn in den Katakomben selbst haben sprechen hören, mit Bewegung und mit Entzücken gelauscht haben, und geht durch seine Werke, denen knappere Darstellung und gemessenere Haltung häufig zu wünschen wären.
>
> An enthusiastic tendency characterized his lecturing, and all those many who have heard him speak in the catacombs were moved and enchanted as they listened. This [enthusiasm] characterizes all his works, in which a more concise presentation and a more restrained disposition are frequently to be desired.

The dichotomy Mommsen seems to have had in mind is that between Christianity/darkness/emotionalism and pre-Christian antiquity/light/rationalism, and this trope is solidified, in remarkable and striking language, in his own speech on the catacombs, which mentions De Rossi directly.[80] This speech plays on spatial imagery, locating the study of the catacombs below ground, in gloomy recesses beyond the reach of the sun, as in an early sentence: 'Meine Studien gehören im ganzen der Oberwelt an und nur beiläufig führt mich mein Weg

---

[78] Mommsen 1894, 462; Gregorovius [1991], 77.

[79] Mommsen 1894, 466. Wilamowitz was also among the audience on one of these occasions, as indicated by Calder and Kirstein 2003, I, 201, Anm. 610: 'Vgl. Wilamowitz, Erinnerungen, 145: "Aber wie stark war die Wirkung, als G. de Rossi einmal in den Calixtkatakomben für uns sprach. Es war nicht nur der Genuß seiner unvergleichlichen Beredsamkeit, er erweckte auch das Bedauern, daß man einem ganzen Gebiete der Wissenschaft fern blieb".'

[80] Mommsen, 'Die Katakomben Roms: Vortrag, gehalten im Berliner Unionsverein, 13. Januar 1871,' reprinted in *Reden und Aufsätze* [Mommsen 1871a]. The piece was originally published in *Das Neue Reich* (1871) 113–128, and an English translation appeared in *The Contemporary Review*, under the title, 'The Roman Catacombs' [Mommsen 1871b]. The translation omits certain key sentences (including one alluding to 'das Gedächtnishaus' in Charlottenburg), but its existence suggests Mommsen's renown outside Germany at this point in his career.

hinab zu diesen Geistern der Tiefe.' He protests that his listeners could find a better guide 'durch jene finsteren Bereiche' than himself, but he pledges that his approach to the subject will be 'wissenschaftlich,' thereby casting light on it. In his University lectures, Mommsen is reported to have employed a similarly 'subterranean' image, labeling Christianity a 'Köhlerglauben,' albeit one encountered among 'counts and barons, and of historical interest as a result.'[81] In this connection, it is not surprising that the speech on the catacombs is rich in allusions to the Middle Ages. Thus, he laments the duty of subjecting the word 'catacomb' itself to '[d]as philologische Marterwerkzeug' and '[d]ie eifrigen Herren Inquisitoren,' and he concludes the speech with a baroque portrait of Alarich's Sack of Rome. In truly Gibbonian fashion, he describes the scene of Alarich's laughter at the senatorial ambassadors and the effect of his devastation on the city: 'Die Armut trat an die Stelle des Reichtums, Verzagtheit an die Stelle des Übermutes.'[82]

Afterward, Rome slumbered for a millennium, and Christian scholars, he suggests, gradually reconfigured the past to suit their own interests. It is in this context that he explicitly refers to De Rossi and his hypotheses concerning early Christian burial practices. Interestingly, Mommsen first introduces De Rossi (302) through his brother Michele, who was, at that time, excavating various burial sites in the Roman suburbs, noting that he is the brother 'des berühmten Begründers der wissenschaftlichen Durchforschung der Katakomben, Giambattista de Rossi.' After focusing his audience's attention on various matters related to the catacombs, Mommsen expresses his dissatisfaction with De Rossi's hypothesis that certain Christian cemeteries had their origin in the funerary *collegia* arranged within prominent households: '[I]n der Tat ist dies die Ansicht der ersten Autorität auf diesem Forschungsgebiet, des ebenso scharfsinnigen wie gewissenhaften Giambattista de Rossi. Ich kann indes nicht leugnen, daß mir die von ihm vorgebrachten Beweise nicht auszureichen scheinen' (306). Noting that other scholars have attempted to connect pagan *collegia* with Christian cemeteries, he observes, in a rather cutting remark, that it was only natural for a Christian writer, 'sei es des fünfzehnten sei es des sechsten Jahrhunderts,' to make such a claim

---

[81] Rebenich 1993, 138–139 with Anm. 52. This comment, taken from Sebastian Hensel's lecture notes from Sommer 1886, is also quoted by Demandt 1990, 292.

[82] Mommsen 1871a, 295 and 315. On this theme, see Croke 1990.

(307). One might conclude, then, that even in the speaker's century, anyone motivated to look for something—especially something that seems to be related to one's own conception of the Christian religion—will be almost certain to find it.

One may presume that Mommsen was referring (although he does not mention the journal specifically) to three articles De Rossi had published in his *Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana* in May and December of 1865, concerning inscriptions found in the 'Cemetery of Domitilla.' De Rossi introduced this theme in a series of short pieces, entitled 'Delle nuove scoperte nel cemetero di Domitilla,' 'Le iscrizioni trovate nei sepolcri all'aperto cielo nella villa Patrizi,' and, the longest and most detailed, 'Le varie e successive condizioni di legalità dei cemeteri, il vario grado di libertà dell'arte cristiana, e la legalità della medesima religione nel primo secolo, verificate dalle recenti scoperte nel cemetero di Domitilla.'[83] In the first, describing the nature of excavation in this area, he effuses that these are exciting discoveries: '. . . ed accrescono testimonianze all'illustrazione d'uno dei punti che più da vicino tocca le controversie religiose nella scienza delle cristiane antichità.' This claim concerning the 'scientific' study of Christian antiquities seems to have been incorporated into Mommsen's characterization of (at least his approach to the subject) as being 'wissenschaftlich.'

However, in the second article in this series, De Rossi introduces an inscription found in the vicinity of the cemetery, which was evidently used by Christians at an early date. The text, which he dates to the second century CE, is a standard reservation of the site for a man and his dependents, but it also makes allowance for those '*at* [sic] *religionem pertinentes meam*.'[84] While there is nothing obviously 'Christian' about the inscription or the immediate context of the burial, De Rossi wonders whether the odd phrase on the stone could lead to such a connection, and pledges to return to the question at greater length.[85]

---

[83] De Rossi 1865a; De Rossi 1865b; De Rossi 1865c.

[84] *C. I. L.* 6.10412. Mommsen adds, concerning this and the previous inscription: 'Tituli hi ad christianam fortasse religionem pertinent; cfr. de Rossi I. c. p. 92.'

[85] De Rossi 1865b, 54: 'E il culto idolatrico si chiamava egli dai suoi professori *religio mea*? Che se questa formola s'addice piuttosto ad un monumento cristiano, poterono forse i fedeli di Cristo nei primi secoli appellare la loro fede *religionem meam*, ed escludere legalmente dal sepolcro gentilizio i liberti ed i posteri a quella *religione non appartenenti*?'

The subject was duly reopened in his contribution to the *Bullettino* in December. The key problem was to decide what the deceased meant by *religio*, and how one could be said to have 'belonged' to it. Such a designation could not be compared to anything from a specifically pagan context, he argued; hence, 'la clausula, che i liberti ed i posteri sieno ammessi nel monumento, purchè *pertinentes ad religionem* del fondatore, è chiaro indizio costui essere stato od Ebreo o Cristiano.'[86] De Rossi then shows why the group could not have been Jews, referring to the exile of the Jews under Claudius. (Such an argument might not be at all compelling today, of course.)[87] Accordingly, he was left with the conclusion that the speaker is a Christian, but one who is unable to divulge the fact, in the aftermath of the Neronian persecution, and given the potentially criminal hazard of taking on the *nomen ipsum* of being a Christian.

Once a specific exemption had been promulgated for associations that were gathering funds for the burial of their members, in a Senatus Consultum passed at some point before 136 CE and quoted in the Lanuvian inscription, the Christians dared to claim the right to meet—and legitimately so—on this basis. In doing so, they had adopted a perfectly correct and legally justifiable stance, in De Rossi's opinion.[88] Though he does not make the point explicitly, the reason this is so significant is that Tertullian had claimed, against the Christians' detractors, that his co-religionists were, indeed, a legitimate, legal, and respectable group, entitled to assemble on the perfectly valid basis of providing funerals for their members. In fact, in this passage of the *Apologeticum*, he seems to be echoing the words of the Lanuvian SC, observing that his fellow Christians collect a *stips menstrua*, a portion of which was designed, specifically, '*egenis alendis humandisque*.'[89]

---

[86] De Rossi 1865c, 93.

[87] Rome in the 1850s and 1860s was the scene of a famous episode of anti-Semitism, recently explored in Kertzer 1997. (See especially Chapter 14: 'The Church Strikes Back,' for the wider context.)

[88] De Rossi 1865c, 98: 'Perciò i Cristiani in quanto possessori di cemeteri communi costituirono *ipso jure* uno di siffatti collegi: e per privarli dei beneficii del senatusconsulto era necessaria la dichiarazione dell'essere essi incorsi nella clausula della legge *dummodo hoc praetextu collegium illicitum non coeat*.' This clause is adapted from the *Digest* passage quoted above.

[89] Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 38 and 39: *Corpus sumus de conscientia religionis et disciplinae unitate et spei foedere . . . Modicam unusquisque stipem menstruam die . . . apponit.* It is in this context that he quotes the pagans' admiring *vide ut invicem se diligant.*

The conclusion is thus already implicit, and will be made quite clear in a significant passage of the third volume of *La Roma sotterranea*.[90] Describing the position of the *collegia* in Roman law and society, De Rossi observes that both these groups and nascent Christian organizations employed familial terms in reference to each other, especially that of 'brother.' He then turns his attention to a particular set of inscriptions, recording an interment of one or more persons, with the name of a mysterious (and otherwise unattested) group, most often rendered in the genitive plural. An example of this is *C. I. L.* 6.10270, which reads: *Euchario(rum). DM L. Lictorio Evangelo, bonae memoriae viro, fecit L. Lictorius Speratus filius*. An important element to note is that the group does not, in any of these specific cases, seem to have performed the burial itself, or at least not fully, as there is generally an heir or survivor named in the text. However, De Rossi's interest was drawn more to the types of names one may find on the stones, most of which are derived from a small set of similar Greek words, but 'senza allusione veruna a religione nè a culto idolatrico' (3, 513).

Since the late nineteenth century, these inscriptions have been classed among the 'supernomina', i.e. words cut above the text of the inscription, with no obvious connection to the text itself.[91] Concerning these particular texts, De Rossi concludes that the terms are 'gentilician' references to members of certain families, and that the Eusebii, for example, would have been, at least originally, the heirs and dependents sharing the name or honorific title 'Eusebius.' He does not, at least here, make the claim that these are Christians, euphemistically calling themselves 'Eusebii' in order to elude the attention of the authorities, but this is the obvious implication, especially in one passage (3, 513). Thus, while one cannot be certain that these specific groups were disguised Christians, they might have served as a model for Christian 'brotherhoods,' and their common plots might have been the germ for the earliest Christian cemeteries.

This passage of De Rossi's *magnum opus* was both influential and misunderstood, at least in his estimation, by others. Those interested in De Rossi or in people of his type and era are indeed fortunate

[90] De Rossi 1864–1877, 3, 513. The second volume appeared in 1867, and a fourth was in preparation when de Rossi died in 1894.

[91] For which see, especially, Kajanto 1966. For an analysis of one of these texts, with relevant bibliography, see also Perry 2002.

to be able to read his correspondence,[92] in lucid and fluent French, with Louis Duchesne, the director of the École Française de Rome and editor of the *Liber pontificalis* (Paris, 1886–1892).[93] Spanning two decades and containing revealing commentary on all the major classicists of the day, the correspondence fleshes out the relationship between De Rossi and Duchesne. In addition to the frequent allusions by both men to Mommsen, which will be explored below, the letters also contain scholarly opinion, though delivered in a more direct and informal manner than may be found in their published works.

On 19 June 1882, De Rossi wrote a long and enthusiastic (as revealed by the frequent underscorings, errors, and crossings out that Saint-Roch preserves) letter to Duchesne, laying out his views on precisely this subject. De Rossi seems to have been alarmed that Duchesne had, in his letter of 10 June,[94] misconstrued his argument concerning 'le droit du *corpus christianorum*, comme possesseur de cimetières,' and he attributes this misrepresentation to 'la mauvaise influence des abrégés et des paraphrases.'[95] Because Duchesne has, in his opinion, presented his thesis in exactly the opposite way (underscored) he had intended, De Rossi notes that he has reread these pages in his third volume '[c]raignant de m'être parfois expliqué d'une manière inexacte,' and here summarizes his opinion, 'définitivement.' The key problem is, he claims, that Duchesne has concluded that the early Christian churches 'être *dissimulées* sous les apparences du *collegium funeraticium*.' With all of its moral implications, 'dissembling' is not at all the characterization of the primitive Christians De Rossi had wished to convey. Rather, the Christians

[92] Saint-Roch 1995.

[93] See especially the biography by Waché (1992). It is surely no accident that Mommsen began his work on the *Liber pontificalis* shortly after Duchesne's had appeared—and the two continued to disagree on various editorial points. Further, see Rebenich 1993, 146, and also Mommsen 1898, cx, for a caustic description—in Mommsen's inimitable style—of the inadequacies of Duchesne's edition of the text.

[94] Saint-Roch 1995, Letter 172.—Duchesne to De Rossi, Paris 10 June 1882, 218–219 at 218. The sentence that seems to have drawn De Rossi's attention reads: 'Quant aux collèges funéraires, je suis très frappé comme vous des facilités offertes par cette institution pour abriter de petites réunions de chrétiens; mais il me semble impossible de croire que les grandes églises du IIIe siècle *aient pu se dissimuler* derrière elle' [emphasis added].

[95] Saint-Roch 1995, Letter 174.—De Rossi to Duchesne, Rome 19 June 1882, 220–222 at 221.

were fully *within* their right to perform burial services, and they were not attempting to dodge the law under a false pretext. The letter goes on, at length, concerning the legal, *ipso jure*, right of Christians to assemble, on the strength of their being legitimate 'funerary societies.' Again, he does not refer to Tertullian's justification of Christian association, but this is the implied subtext. Nevertheless, De Rossi's argument on this point hits upon a serious problem: the utter lack of evidence that the Christians were typically recognized, *by the authorities*, as legitimate claimants to this exemption under the law.

De Rossi concedes that he is obligated to set the 'Christian' monuments merely alongside the official regulations concerning funerary colleges, and that he is not, at least at this moment, able to determine 'quant au mode *précis* d'application de ce droit aux chrétiens.' However, he is convinced that such a connection does exist, as he tells Duchesne in a remarkable and revealing passage that begins with his assertion that: 'It is, *for me*, obvious that there exists a correlation between the two classes of facts, of arrangements, of the development of institutions.'[96] Concerning 'the precise degree' of this correlation, 'quelles *ont été* les variations dans le cours du 3e siècle,' and the roles paid by other factors, he has 'taken care not to define.' However, he states that he, 'like you,' has only hypothesized that the small Christian communities were able to assimilate themselves to the collegial model and, 'thus, almost to live under its shade.' A key clause follows, as he notes: 'ce *serait* le cas du *collegium convictorum* de Fano *s'il y a lieu de soupçonner* qu'il cache des chrétiens.' The reference is, apparently, to an inscription marking the burial plot of the 'convictores,' 'qui una epulo vesci solent,' discovered at Fanum Fortunae and published as *C. I. L.* 11.6244.[97]

Of course, 'suspicion,' 'thought,' and 'personal evidence' may be fine for private correspondence between two friends who often share common views, but publication is clearly a different matter, especially when the principal reader would be in fundamental disagreement

---

[96] Saint-Roch 1995, 222: 'Il est *pour moi* évident qu'il y a corrélation entre les deux ordres de faits, de dispositions, de développement d'institutions.'

[97] *C. I. L.* 11.6244: '*loc(us) sep(ulturae) convictor(um), qui una epulo vesci solent, in fr. p. ----- in agr. p. -----.*' De Rossi was certainly incorrect in his 'suspicion' about this group, as dozens of other *collegia* 'ate meals together' and made arrangements for general commensality and conviviality. (See Waltzing 1900, 4, 543–544, for a table of 18 similar inscriptions.) There was also a group of 'convictores'—again, with no obvious connection to Christianity—at Calecula in Baetica, cataloged as *C. I. L.* 2.5500.

with the premise. It is in this context that we should evaluate what De Rossi had said five years previously, in the article in honor of Mommsen. This piece recapitulates the segment of *Roma sotterranea* on the Syncratii, Gaudentii, Eusebii, etc., with two new texts added to the group. There is also the (quite interesting) revelation that De Rossi owned one of these inscriptions, personally—perhaps an indication that he identified their subjects as co-religionists.[98]

Nevertheless, he does not here make the further claim, concerning the *corpus Christianorum*, that he had made in the fuller treatment, nor does he advance the concept he would discuss with Duchesne in the later letter. Despite these omissions, Mommsen clearly understood the thrust of De Rossi's argument, as is revealed in his own commentary to this set of inscriptions in the *C. I. L.* As he writes in the introduction to these texts, '*Collegia funeraticia peculiaribus nominibus designata, quae viguisse videntur tertio fere et quarto p. C. saeculo, cum non raro commemorentur in titulis qui editi sunt in huius voluminis partibus prioribus, placuit hoc loco componere reliquas inscriptiones ad ea spectantes. De eis collegiis nuper disputavit I. B. de Rossi* [in three works cited: a brief mention in the *Bullettino* from 1877, *Roma sotterranea*, and the honorary piece described above].'[99] Another brief, but revealing, comment is included for inscription 6.10277, which merely reads *Melaniorum*. On this text, Mommsen writes, '*Non tam ad collegium videtur pertinere, quam ad gentem Melaniorum, quam viguisse saeculo quarto monuit Rossius.*' Thus, he may have questioned the identification of certain of these texts with *collegia* of any sort. Accordingly, De Rossi's theory of a connection between familial colleges and Christian brotherhoods would collapse.

Despite De Rossi's subtlety in the *Commentationes philologae* submission, the piece does contain hints of what he intended the reader to conclude. Noting that the names of the groups are not directly related to the nomina or cognomina of the founders (as far as these can be determined), he suggests that each of the names '. . . fu tolto dal

[98] In reference to an inscription with the supernomen *Arpagius*, he observes, 'Ma nella pietra, che ora è in mia casa . . .' [De Rossi 1877, 708]. This personal collection, of 163 pieces, was donated by his family to the Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana in 1928. The editor observes that there are only very few Christian inscriptions in the collection (eight of the set are identifiable as such), but she does not introduce De Rossi's theories concerning texts like these. See Frascati 1997, #53, 107–108.

[99] *C. I. L.* 6, part 2, page 1367.

greco e scelto con avvertenza di preferire le appellazioni di buon augurio o degne ed onorate: *Eutychii, Eutropii, Eusebii, Gaudentii, Eugenii* e simili.'[100]

Because these names are so vague, we are left, he argues, with the task of trying to discern who they were, and why they chose to label themselves in this fashion; to establish their chronology; and to determine the relationship between their existence and frequency and the proliferation of *collegia funeraticia* under the Empire, 'massime nel secolo terzo.'[101] The emphasis on the third century is not coincidental, given what De Rossi would write to Duchesne regarding this period, 'when the Christians were becoming too numerous to be ignored.' One of the key components to De Rossi's argument is essentially chronological: the period of the greatest diffusion of these texts overlaps with the most prominent era of Christian growth and assimilation into Roman society (at least as he understood this process). Thus, the two institutions are parallel, if not directly connected, and it would not take much effort to see them as *related* phenomena, as he 'suspects' they are, at least in Duchesne's hearing.

That De Rossi could not say this directly, in the presence of his old friend and collaborator, with whom he had been associated for over three decades, is perhaps an indication of the dynamics of this friendship. Other reflections of these dynamics may be discerned in the rest of De Rossi's correspondence with Duchesne, which was presumably unavailable to Rebenich when he wrote his article on De Rossi and Mommsen.[102] Both De Rossi and Duchesne employed well-chosen, lively, and often quite amusing characterizations of 'le farouche Allemand' in their midst.[103]

The portrait of Mommsen that emerges from this correspondence is that of a brilliant scholar and a loyal friend, but one whose direct, and even violent, manner of expression filled both Catholic gentlemen with trepidation. For example, in 1889, De Rossi marvels at Mommsen's activity and energy in his seventy-first year of life: 'Quel

---

[100] De Rossi 1877, 710. Perhaps it was this 'avvertenza' that led Duchesne to his mistaken conclusion concerning Christian 'dissembling'?

[101] De Rossi 1877, 711.

[102] Rebenich (1995, 185f) does cite Duchesne's letters to Mommsen, and De Rossi's to Mommsen, but the Duchesne-De Rossi correspondence does not seem to appear.

[103] Saint-Roch 1995, Letter 453.—De Rossi to Duchesne, 25 June 1888, 563–564 at 564.

jeunesse d'activité et de productions tout à fait nouvelles. . . .' After a dinner with Mommsen (a frequent occurrence for both Duchesne and De Rossi, judging from the correspondence), Duchesne observes that Mommsen 'm'a enchanté. Du reste ses livres montrent ce qu'il est, fort et loyal.'[104] There is concern mixed with the enchantment, however: Duchesne observes, after three dinners with Mommsen in 1885, 'Il a eu un mot terrible sur le pauvre Kraus,'[105] and De Rossi refers to 'the wild German' specifically to reassure Duchesne that Mommsen is not saying similarly 'terrible' things about him. In fact, he observes, Duchesne has risen so high in Mommsen's affections that he would probably say, '*Galle* (non pas *Galilane*) *vicisti*!'[106] The allusion to Julian the Apostate is, of course, a deliberate choice, with specific resonance for these men of the Church. This theme is addressed in a vivid (if fantastic) image Duchesne employs when discussing Mommsen's work in the field of Late Antiquity:[107]

> Mommsen fait ma désolation. Il entre dans l'érudition ecclésiastique comme un rhinocéros dans un champ de vigne, écrasant à droite et à gauche, sans s'émouvoir du dégât. Il n'est décidément pas assez *monsignore*.

> Mommsen is giving me much grief. He enters into ecclesiastical scholarship like a rhinoceros in a vineyard, crushing plants to the right and to the left, without bothering himself about the damage he is doing. He is decidedly not sufficiently 'monsignore'.

The 'monsignore' is an allusion to an earlier letter De Rossi had written to Duchesne, describing a dinner with Mommsen and the

---

[104] Saint-Roch 1995, Letter 483.—De Rossi to Duchesne, Rome 1 September 1889, 599–600 at 599; Letter 350.—Duchesne to De Rossi, Paris 19 October 1885, 450–451 at 450.

[105] Saint-Roch 1995, Letter 354.—Duchesne to De Rossi, Paris 7 November 1885, 454–455 at 455. One may compare Gregorovius' reactions to Mommsen, as for example his comment recorded on 30 March 1873: 'Er [Mommsen] ist offenbar, wie Richard Wagner, an Größenwahn krank' [Gregorovius [1991] 330].

[106] Saint-Roch 1995, Letter 453 (above, n. 102), at 564. The source for this ersatz confession is (in Greek) Theodoret, *HE* 3.20, but Duchesne has rendered the Latin translation 'Galilane', rather than employing a direct transliteration, i.e., 'Galilaee'. In his poem 'Hymn to Proserpine' (1866), Swinburne preferred the version, 'Vicisti, Galilaee,' and this seems to have been more common usage in the period.

[107] Saint-Roch 1995, Letter 559.—Duchesne to De Rossi, Paris 13 November 1892, 687–688 at 688. Duchesne may be alluding to the opening paragraph of the Papal Bull of excommunication against Martin Luther, the 'Exsurge, Domine' (15 June 1520), which enjoins God to exterminate the 'vulpes quaerentes demoliri vineam,' and the 'aper de silva' that is threatening St. Peter's vineyard. Perhaps he chose to plant a more exotic animal in the vineyard, in order to update the image?

surprising conversation that ensued. Noting that Mommsen was (in 1885) working on the *Chronica Minora* of the fourth through sixth centuries, De Rossi observes that his old friend has experienced a conversion, of sorts:[108]

> Il est très loin du *fastidium* classique de ces basses époques qu'il affectait jadis. Il m'a même avoué de comprendre toute la valeur de ces époques de transformation du monde antique, et qu'il voudrait être plus jeune pour s'y jeter dedans à corps perdu. Il m'a ajouté cependant: *per intendere questi tempi bisogna essere un poco monsignore*: probablement ce compliment était à mon adresse. Je suis pourtant un *monsignore* en disgrâce au Vatican. . . .

In this, however, Duchesne seems to have captured Mommsen's meaning more nearly than De Rossi, due perhaps to the latter's 'milde Natur.' As a Vatican *scriptor*, the title De Rossi held for fifty years, he was entitled to be addressed as *Monsignore*; he was, moreover, a *Commendatore*, having been awarded the title by Pope Leo XIII. Mommsen, on the other hand, seems to have been using the title in an adjectival sense, i.e., suggesting that one must take on an air of ecclesiastical courtesy, mumbling, 'Monsignore . . ., Monsignore . . .,' in order to understand an ecclesiastical age. Duchesne, who was also a *Monseigneur*, understood that he and De Rossi shared more than a title, but also an attitude of respect and accommodation to the Church and its various dignities—one that Mommsen simply could not adopt. (See above, for the controversy over the competing editions of the *Liber pontificalis* and his reflections on them.)

De Rossi's allusion to 'disgrace at the Vatican' is an exaggeration, of course, but it signals the change of emphasis and direction brought about by the accession of Leo XIII in 1878. Leo's immediate predecessor, Pius IX (1846–1878), had been an active supporter of the efforts De Rossi had launched (and the dedication of his *Roma sotterranea* underlines this fact),[109] and his political interests had been in line with De Rossi's own, as the Gregorovius conversation suggests. The origin of De Rossi's present 'disgrace' seems to have been in his close friendship with Cardinal Pitra, one of whose letters was

---

[108] Saint-Roch 1995, Letter 334.—De Rossi to Duchesne, Rome 5 May 1885, 424–426 at 425.

[109] In the 1870s, De Rossi had obtained a private audience with the Pope, in order to propose his dedication. Pius IX eagerly assented, especially as De Rossi had labeled him 'a second Damasus'. In response, the Pope suggested that, if he were Damasus, De Rossi was his 'St. Jerome' (Baruffa 1994, 77–80).

published in a Belgian newspaper in May 1885. The letter was interpreted, by the newspaper's editor, as being critical of the Pope, and De Rossi seems to have suffered from his friendship with this man as a result.[110]

De Rossi may have fallen out of favor with the Vatican, but his essential hypothesis on the connection between *collegia* and the earliest Christian cemeteries has held up rather well, over the course of the past century. Interestingly, though, Duchesne himself remained unpersuaded by his arguments, in either published or private form, as he continued to offer respectful, if firm, counterarguments to De Rossi's hypothesis. In his influential *Histoire ancienne de l'Église* (1906–1910), he maintained: 'En somme, les empereurs du IIIe siècle ont tous eu à l'égard de l'Église une attitude fort tranchée: ou bien ils l'ont persécutée ouvertement, ou bien ils l'ont tolérée. En aucun cas ils ne l'ont ignorée. . . . De fictions légales, de collèges funéraires, de titres mystérieux, les documents ne donnent ni témoignage ni soupçon.'[111] Duchesne's position was incorporated into J.-P. Waltzing's study of the Roman professional corporations (1895–1900), which is still, after a full century, the standard book on the subject.[112] (See below, Chapter 2.) Drawing on Duchesne's points about the lack of evidence and his own competency as a Tertullian scholar, Waltzing even published an article specifically on 'La thèse de J.-B. de Rossi sur les collèges funéraires chrétiens.'[113]

However, there was also, in the early decades of the twentieth century, a movement against Duchesne's assertions, designed to rehabilitate and reinstitute De Rossi's vision of the early Christian communities. A few scholars in the 1930s and 1940s, including Gennaro Maria Monti and Fernand de Visscher, maintained that De Rossi's essential hypothesis had been correct, at least in its main points, and that Duchesne and Waltzing had overlooked evidence that supported this position.[114] So successful was this revision that, in 1948, de

[110] For a description of this scandal and its result, see the commentary in Saint-Roch (1995, 434, n. 14), and Maccarrone 1989, 196. In the latter, stress is laid on the 'conservative and apparently fanatical spirit' demonstrated by Pitra.
[111] Duchesne 1911, 1, 387. This book was placed on the *Index* in 1912, as it was perceived to be disrespectful to the early saints of the Church.
[112] Waltzing 1895, I, 314–321. Among other scholars writing in support of this conclusion were Besnier 1932 and Roberti 1927.
[113] Waltzing 1912.
[114] Monti 1936 and de Visscher 1948.

Visscher could claim that the most recent archaeological discoveries had confirmed and multiplied the evidence for his theory. In fact, 'Si bien qu'aujourd'hui nous nous trouvons en présence d'une donnée générale qui n'est plus guère contestable.'[115] In the course of a debate about a set of these inscriptions in 1971 and 1972, Marta Sordi, Maria Luisa Cavigiolo, Mara Bonfioli, and Silvio Panciera addressed De Rossi's thesis, in two competing articles. Sordi and Cavigiolo observed that De Rossi's is 'l'ipotesi oggi più seguita fra i moderni,' and they suggest that the group of inscriptions with which they are dealing 'forniscono forse la più antica attestazione epigrafica di questa organizzazione e la conferma dell'ipotesi avanzata dai moderni.'[116] Bonfioli and Panciera challenged the conclusions of this article, but they also observed that they were clearly designed to corroborate the thesis 'già sostenuta dal De Rossi.'[117] Moreover, Éric Rebillard has recently employed De Rossi's thesis as his beginning point, examining the legal ramifications of 'Church ownership' of cemeteries, through Late Antiquity.[118] In his review of this book, John Kloppenborg observes that, since *La Roma sotterranea cristiana*, 'the *opinio communis* has been that at least by the beginning of the third century, Christians owned and managed cemeteries and that it soon became normative for Christians to be buried in such church-controlled cemeteries.'[119]

Perhaps more significantly, versions of De Rossi's thesis have—probably unwittingly—been incorporated into the recent, and ever-expanding, literature on the 'sociology' of early Christian communities. In his influential study of *The First Urban Christians*, Wayne A. Meeks draws an extensive comparison between the forms of connection inherent in the 'voluntary associations' and in the Pauline groups. Commenting on the historiography on this point, he adds:[120]

> Some modern scholars, especially those in the nineteenth century, have speculated that the first Christian groups may in fact have imitated the pattern of voluntary associations, especially the common *collegia tenuiorum*, or burial societies. Although these proposals did not win much

---

[115] de Visscher 1948, 39.

[116] Sordi and Cavigiolo 1971, 372. Not surprisingly, De Rossi's personal collection of inscriptions also included one from this *collegium*—Frascati 1997, #20, 76–78.

[117] Bonfioli and Panciera 1971/2; Bonfioli and Panciera 1972/3.

[118] Rebillard 2003.

[119] Kloppenborg 2005.

[120] Meeks 1983, 77–80 at 77.

> support at the time, recently there have been new calls for a fresh examination of analogies between the associations and the early churches.

Meeks does not cite De Rossi in his footnote here, but his notes on this passage reveal how many of the most influential scholars on this topic, including Robert Wilken, Abraham Malherbe, and L. Michael White, have addressed these similarities, and have come to similar conclusions.[121]

As this is the case, it is particularly important to seek out the context in which these ideas were first formulated, and then to consider the impact of this context, in both personal and professional terms, on their creation. Both of the cases analyzed in this chapter have turned on the depth of religious feeling that could be detected in the ancient world. Mommsen 'secularized' the *collegia funeraticia*, attempting to discern a group of cultors fundamentally *without* overriding religious commitments. By contrast, De Rossi sought to explain the growth of Christian communities in the Roman Empire by positing the *collegium* as a suitable subterfuge for a persecuted minority. Thus, while one man feigned 'classical fastidiousness', rejecting the 'magic potions' of religion, the other felt a kinship with his co-religionists, as they dodged official oversight and would eventually triumph over the officials themselves.

This chapter also suggests that Mommsen had a hand in the development of De Rossi's 'hypothèse,' both through his professional comments on the inscriptions, and through his personal conviction that there was something fundamentally misguided in the quest for 'Christian origins' by De Rossi and others of his type. It is perhaps in this way that scholarship continues, and should continue, to be done. Borrowing Duchesne's image, both the 'rhinoceros' and those who attempt to restrain it may be responsible for the preparation of new fields of endeavor. On the other hand, once the vineyard is trampled, it is also difficult to piece together the individual vines, and thus crucial elements of its original condition may be lost forever. As the following chapters will demonstrate, this has been, by no means, an isolated occurrence in the history of *collegia* scholarship.

---

[121] Ibid., 221–222, nn. 14–17. Further, on this theme, see Wilken 1984, especially Chapter 2: 'Christianity as a Burial Society,' 31–47; McCready 1996; and Harland 2003, 178–181.

CHAPTER TWO

JEAN-PIERRE WALTZING'S 'PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS' AND THE LEGACY OF CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY

In 1811, the essayist Charles Lamb observed that nothing tends 'to keep up in the imaginations of the poorer sort of people, a generous horror of the workhouse more than the manner in which pauper funerals are conducted.'[1] According to this and other accounts from the period, the *tenuiores* of Industrial Britain had much to fear from the coarseness and anonymity of a poor man's burial: no headstone, no ornaments for the coffin, not even an escort to the gravesite. A similarly generous horror must have beset the minds of Rome's 'lesser sorts,' as the '*puticuli*' were within sight—and smell—of the city walls. Varro notes that this term had come to be applied to 'the public land beyond the Esquiline' because '*putescebant ibi cadavera projecta*.'[2] A portion of this mass graveyard was excavated in the 1880s under the direction of Rodolfo Lanciani. Horrible indeed was what he found there:[3]

> [T]he contents . . . were reduced to a uniform mass of black, viscid, pestilent, unctuous matter; in a few cases the bones could in a measure be singled out and identified. The reader will hardly believe me when I say that men and beasts, bodies and carcasses, and any kind of unmentionable refuse of the town were heaped up in those dens.

In fact, he adds, work at this site was so distressing that 'I was obliged to relieve my gang of workmen from time to time, because the smell from that polluted ground . . . was absolutely unbearable even for men so hardened to every kind of hardship as my excavators.'[4]

---

[1] As cited in Laqueur 1983, 109.

[2] *De ling. Lat.* 5.25. Compare Horace, *Serm.* 1.8.14–6: '*nunc licet Esquiliis habitare salubribus atque aggere in aprico spatiari, qui modo tristes albis informem spectabant ossibus agrum.*'

[3] Lanciani 1888, 65–67.

[4] On this olfactory observation, Keith Hopkins commented (in his inimitable fashion), 'Lanciani's report of the smell is high-flown; at first, I was sceptical that smells could survive for 2,000 years. But Professor A.M. Snodgrass, from his archaeological

In both societies, ancient and modern, it would have been natural to avoid contemplating this final indignity that awaited one's fellow men. However, the experience of actually witnessing a pauper's funeral altered the course of the (seventh) Earl of Shaftesbury's career, at least as he recalled it. While at Harrow in 1815, he[5]

> saw that four or five drunken men were carrying a roughly made coffin, containing the mortal remains of one of their fellows, for burial. Staggering as they turned the corner, they let their burden fall, and then they broke out into foul and horrible language. It was a sickening spectacle. . . . [Thereupon, he] determined that, with the help of God, he would from that time forth devote his life to pleading the cause of the poor and friendless.

In this regard, a modern person might, quite reasonably, ask whether Varro or other Romans of his sort would have been spurred to a similar course of action. Did the horror faced by the *tenuiores* constitute a threat to the general well-being of their society? If so, was it deemed possible to ameliorate their condition, with or without government involvement? Would anyone really have wished to?

At the close of the nineteenth and the opening of the twentieth centuries, the role of the state in the public's welfare was gradually expanded and became increasingly entrenched, particularly throughout Western Europe. Moreover, it was in this era that workingmen's associations, together with the ideologies of trade unionism and syndicalism, rose to prominence, sometimes in cooperation with, and other times in opposition to, the nation-state. In these years, studies of both the '*collegia funeraticia*' and the *collegia* in general were colored, to a surprising extent, by these pervasive trends in contemporary Western societies. Moreover, as will become clear, these studies provided the fundamental paradigms by which *collegia* were evaluated throughout the twentieth century, and up to the present.

The pivotal question in analyses of the funerary colleges, for instance, was to what extent the Roman government perceived an interest in burying the poor, and thus permitted private institutions of charity, the *collegia tenuiorum*, to flourish. Conversely, it was also

experience in Greece, assures me that they can last even longer . . .' [Hopkins 1983, 209, n. 10].

[5] An incident noted in Laqueur 1983 (110), taken from Hodder 1886, I, 47–48.

argued that only individual poor people and their associates, of whatever type, would have benefited from these organizations and that government officials acknowledged no responsibility to assuage their 'horror.' In similar fashion, general surveys of both the public and private activities of the *collegia* addressed the concerns of the Industrial age, e.g. the freedoms of workers to organize and to pressure their employers in pursuit of their own interests. In this context, the key questions concerned the extent to which a government is obliged to encourage or to limit free assembly, in the interests of economic development and public well-being.

Indeed, scholars in this era chose to focus on vaguely sociological questions, with an eye fixed firmly on the ground shifting rapidly beneath their own feet. Was Rome a model 'progressive' society, one committed to looking after its poorer citizens in their final hour of need, or was it the kind of society that would (at least prior to the introduction of Christian charity) have cast the bodies of the poor pêle-mêle into a pit? Can 'corporate action', whether guided—or merely permitted—by a government, remedy a pressing social problem? To what extent can overarching, overreaching State power suppress the natural urges of workers to assemble and to share the few joys of their lives? What would be the consequences, for both workers and the community, of State intervention in the field of economic production?

Jean-Pierre Waltzing's contributions to collegial studies, which remain unmatched since the final volume of the *Étude historique* appeared in 1900, were the direct result of this sort of analysis, and were thus a product of their unique historical situation. His main conclusions, to be explored in detail below, were, first, that Roman workers' associations were merely the result of the sociable desires of their members, and were accordingly no threat to the governments under which they operated. Second, he claimed that a State (and not only one in the distant past) is best served by tolerating, and even by encouraging, associations of this sort. 'Unions' are desirable, according to this argument, because free labor leads inevitably to higher productivity, economic progress, and loyalty to the regime that permits it to flourish. Conversely, a State that persists in interfering with workers' assembly, suppressing their natural urges to associate and harassing them when they attempt to do so, produces only stagnation, disloyalty, and societal collapse. While Waltzing's work

appears authoritative, exhaustive, and complete (at least for 1900),[6] its mise-en-scène must be taken into account, and its biases, which are not at all subtle, must be weighed in its evaluation as a standard reference book today.

Of course, as Mommsen had predicted, any reliable analysis of the Roman *collegia* was made feasible only after the compilation and gradual appearance in print of the individual volumes of *C. I. L.* Waltzing's achievement rests solidly on this basis, as he readily acknowledged, but few of his contemporaries were as quick to realize the immeasurable benefits this tool could provide. In the first attempt to apply Mommsen's category of *collegia funeraticia* by collecting the relevant inscriptions, Traugott Schiess analyzed *Die römischen collegia funeraticia nach den Inschriften* in 1888. Although it was, in Waltzing's estimation, 'très consciencieuse, très touffue, très difficile à lire,'[7] this dissertation contains what was, until very recently,[8] the most complete collection of inscriptions relating to these colleges. There are also an introduction, restating Mommsen's arguments in the *De collegiis* and refuting a few of Cohn's, and four chapters, concerned almost exclusively with the colleges' membership and magistrates. However, at the end of his brief 'Einleitung', Schiess departed from the thesis of the *De collegiis*, offering 'einen Modification' to Mommsen's proposal. Citing the Pliny passage, he maintained that the *collegia tenuiorum* must have been 'Unterstützungskassen,' which aided 'in some way or other the "poorer" (or much better the "lowlier") population.'[9] Accordingly, the SC from which the *kaput* derives was not, as Mommsen had imagined, a blanket SC covering all colleges in all circumstances. Rather, it defined what constituted *collegia tenuiorum*, of which a funerary society was merely one possible manifestation.

As Schiess understood it, nevertheless, his 'modification' did not essentially undermine Mommsen's idea of a discrete category of funerary associations. Moreover, it allowed him to go *beyond* Mommsen's vision, reconstructing an impressive network of social services for

---

[6] There have been attempts, but only in recent years and only for Italy, to update Waltzing in the light of inscriptions discovered in the intervening century. See especially Mennella and Apicella 2000. In her published Heidelberg dissertation, Carola Zimmermann notes that Frank Ausbüttel has also compiled a supplement to Waltzing that remains unpublished [Zimmermann 2002, ix].

[7] Waltzing 1898/9, 283.

[8] Perry 1999.

[9] Schiess 1888, 8.

Rome's lowly, all of which provided a sort of 'safety net' for those who had fallen on hard times. As we shall see, Waltzing managed to snip away this safety net, but its existence is an indicator of the unique place and time in which it was crafted. Though addressing a rather different aspect of the collegial phenomenon, Hermann Maué had come to a similar conclusion in his 1886 Frankfurt dissertation, *Die Vereine der fabri, centonarii und dendrophori im römischen Reich.*[10] Thus, within two years, two young scholars, from opposite parts of the German Reich, pointed to the existence of 'charitable societies' in the Roman Empire. It may not be a coincidence that it was precisely at this time that Chancellor Bismarck was developing and modifying his institutions of 'social insurance'. These scholars might even have selected their topics in response to Bismarck's repeated assertions that charity was the duty of 'ein Staat, der praktisches Christentum treiben will' and had never been attempted previously.[11] It should also be noted that among the new 'Ortskrankenkassen' to emerge in the 1880s was a national 'Begräbniskasse', an institution that persisted into the Weimar period.[12] In any event, Bismarck's social-insurance schemes, particularly as they related to burial of the poor, could boast a long and distinguished pedigree.

Maué and Schiess had used only portions of the *C. I. L.*, but their work compares favorably with other doctoral theses, especially those offered by French candidates for juristic degrees. Concerned merely with the legal status of associations in the Roman Empire, and usually comparing them with their counterparts in other periods of European history, these 'avocats docteurs en droit' generally ignored inscriptions, even those that spoke to the legal recognition and licensing of *collegia*, preferring instead to deal simply with widely available legal texts. Accordingly, in the first volume of his *Étude*, appearing in 1895, Waltzing dismissed these thèses, 'qui ne renferment rien de

[10] Maué 1886, 6: '. . . während die Unterstützungsvereine der Ärmeren auf Gegenseitigkeit (collegia tenuiorum) durch ein generelles Senatsconsult erlaubt waren.'

[11] Bismarck's Speech to the Reichstag, dated 2 April 1881, as recorded in his *Werke in Auswahl* (Bismarck [1976], VI, 532). The 'christliche' element of Bismarck's social policy was also stressed in a glowing account by W.H. Dawson, a British socialist, entitled *Bismarck and State Socialism* (Dawson 1890, 110f).

[12] In December 1918, posters (one is housed in the University of North Carolina's Bowman Gray collection of such materials) commanded Berliners to be registered with one of these organizations, at offices distributed throughout the city.

nouveau.'[13] Nevertheless, they do contain elements of themes he would sound later, in his much more developed and 'scientific' study, and all underscore the contemporary relevance these subjects seem to have had in Western Europe in the 1880s and 1890s.[14]

For one example, Marcel Duseigneur, for his doctoral thesis at Lyon, attempted to sketch out the differences between Roman and French jurisprudence, specifically with reference to associative behavior. Published in 1886, as *Droit romain: Des corporations à Rome; Droit français: Des sociétés coopératives*,[15] the thesis assesses the economic impact of allowing workers to assemble, and draws on a wide (though not very deep) body of data from various societies, especially those since the French Revolution. Despite its title, the Roman section is minimal. Nevertheless, the overall conclusion of the work is that economies, especially in their productive capacities, thrive when workers are left free to unite and to pursue common goals by these means. Likewise, in his 1884 analysis, Albert Gérard[16] argued that economies improve only when workers are allowed to be free agents, independent of governmental control. This fact was, he averred, clear from Roman history, as, in the late third and throughout the fourth centuries CE, 'The corporations became for the emperors a convenient means of tyranny. . . .' Free workers became virtually enslaved to their professions, and, in a rather grandiose phrase, 'the last glimmer of Roman craft and industry began to die out with the last gasp of liberty.'[17] In short, work and industry can only develop when they are allowed to follow their own, independent paths; by intervening in the process, and by tying workers to their hereditary professions, the Roman State suppressed individual initiative and forced workers to be part of its own structure. Thus, logically, when the State weakened and fell, economic development fell with it.[18] While not com-

[13] Waltzing 1895a, I, 16, n. 3.
[14] For a superb study of these theses and their wider context, see Tran 2001, esp. 182–185.
[15] Duseigneur 1886.
[16] Gérard 1884.
[17] Gérard 1884, 2: 'Les corporations deviennent pour les empereurs un moyen commode de tyrannie; elles servent à enchaîner à leur profession des hommes que la pesanteur, toujours croissante, des charges publiques pousse à délaisser tout travail régulier et toute position stable. . . . [L]es ouvriers libres deviennent forcément esclaves de leurs professions . . . et où vient mourir la dernière lueur de l'art et de l'industrie romaine avec le dernier souffle de la liberté.'
[18] Gérard 1884, 28: 'Ce résultat était fatal; pour vivre et se développer, le tra-

piled with scientific rigor, or even basic epigraphic foundations, there is something remarkable here, despite what Waltzing later claimed: the development of a historical argument for the 'liberté' of workers and their associations.

However, the first true attempt to incorporate inscriptional evidence into a general history of the *collegia* was made by Wilhelm (Carl Adolf) Liebenam, in his *Zur Geschichte und Organisation des römischen Vereinswesens*, published at Leipzig in 1890. A Privatdocent at Jena, Liebenam had already produced a lengthy study entitled *Forschungen zur Verwaltungsgeschichte des römischen Kaiserreichs (Studies on the Administrative History of the Roman Empire)*,[19] and he claimed to have turned his attention to the *collegia* for specific reasons. Insisting that the words and deeds of the upper classes, who feature so prominently in our extant sources, ought not be the historian's sole focus, he argued in his 'Vorwort' that it is critical 'to pay close attention above all to the life and activity of the little man, the condition of the Third Estate.'[20] He had chosen to analyze the *collegia* precisely because their records elucidate 'die Lage der untern Volksclassen;' ideally, this present volume would be only one in a series of individual studies,[21] each of which would have 'this end goal firmly in mind' (IV). Moreover, the life and work of the Roman lower classes are relevant to the modern reader, and not merely because 'the consideration of the history of classical antiquity has been made in all previous periods.' In an especially vivid passage, he suggests:[22]

---

vail et l'industrie doivent avoir une vie propre et indépendante; s'ils ont besoin pour vivre de tel ou tel gouvernement, lorsque ce gouvernement disparaît ou faiblit, ils sont entraînés dans sa chute.'

[19] Liebenam 1888. (He also produced a *Festschrift zum fünfzigjährigen Stiftungsfest der Burschenschaft Teutonia zu Jena*, also published at Jena, in 1895 [Liebenam 1895].)

[20] Liebenam 1890, III: '. . . vor allem auch dem Leben und Treiben des kleinen Mannes, der Lage des dritten Standes eine grössere Aufmerksamkeit zuwenden.'

[21] The 'Drei Untersuchungen' of the title refers to the three chapters of which the study is composed, 'Geschichtliche Entwicklung des römischen Vereinswesens', 'Die Vereine im römischen Reich', and 'Organisation der Vereine'.

[22] Liebenam 1890, IV: 'Eine abgeschlossene historische Epoche ist lehrreich für Jeden, der aus der Geschichte lernen will, lehrreich in ihren Vorzügen, wie in ihren Sünden und Missgriffen, besonders aber in den socialen Beziehungen, welche trotz aller durch andere Staatsverhältnisse, Bildung und Religion bedingten Verschiedenheit ein stets wiederkehrendes Grundbild aufweisen.' Compare the remarkably similar segment of the Foreword to Liebenam 1888, III: '. . . sondern überhaupt für die Geschichte jener Epoche von Werth sein wird, da die Männer, welche in den Provinzen in den verschiedensten Aemtern thätig waren, eine grössere Bedeutung hatten, als wir nach modernen Verhältnissen anzunehmen geneigt sind.'

> An eroded historical epoch is instructive for all who will learn from history, instructive in its high points, as well as in its crimes and blunders, but especially in (its) social relationships, which, despite everything, through the conditional variety of various constitutions, culture, and religion, reflect a constantly reappearing foundation.

Thus, in a few short paragraphs, Liebenam had established, for the first time, the legitimacy of 'collegial studies,' not merely as an aspect of Roman social and legal history, but also as a standard by which to judge the institutions of one's own day. He went on to argue that the modern historian must make a sharp break with the 'historisch-antiquarische Fragen' that dominate works like, specifically, Cohn's and Schiess'.[23] The latter in particular, with its near-exclusive focus on the societies' magistrates, missed the chance to be 'eine mehr principiellere Auffassung dieser Fragen [i.e. what burial societies were and did]' (V). By contrast, Liebenam insisted on a much broader understanding of how *collegia* functioned, and what they contributed to the daily life of 'the little man' in Rome, and, by extension, in other societies, as well. Inasmuch as the evidence for *collegia* tells us about Rome's vast underclass, it is fully worth investigating, and especially in one's own day.[24]

Nevertheless, his emotionally charged (and overtly ideological) approach to the subject results in a rather distorted picture of the funerary colleges, among others.[25] Improving on Schiess' proposal, he maintained that the *tenuiores* did not come together solely for the purpose of burying their dead, but 'vielmehr müssen wir sie allgemeiner als Unterstützungscassen für Unfall und Krankheit, Vereine zur Selbsthilfe überhaupt fassen.'[26] To be sure, these 'self-help societies' made a priority of 'providing a cheap but decent burial for the poor,' but they did so in a prevalent atmosphere of 'sociable

---

[23] He cites only these two by name in this section, but it is clear that he is attacking several other recent studies.

[24] Liebenam did continue to write on the subject of the *collegia*, well into the 20th century. In fact, he was selected to contribute the entry on 'Fabri' for the *Dizionario epigrafico* (Liebenam 1922, 10f).

[25] Liebenam does not seem to have been a Marxist, but others of his era applied Marxist principles to the ancient 'underclass', especially in the cities. One of the most prominent scholars of this type was Robert von Pöhlmann, whose classic *Die Übervölkerung der antiken Großstädte im Zusammenhange mit der Gesammtentwicklung städtischer Civilisation*, first published in 1884, was still being reprinted (and thus presumably approved) in East Germany in the 1960s [Pöhlmann 1884].

[26] Liebenam 1890, 40.

mirth' ('Geselligkeit'). This is not very remarkable, however, as 'auch in unserer Zeit bei Vereinen ähnlicher Art beides oft in der merkwürdigsten Weise neben einander hergeht' (40–41). The present is never far removed from Liebenam's thought, and this tendency may explain the considerable force of his next suggestion:[27]

> In a time when the most extravagant wealth and the most abject poverty cut a deep chasm between (the Empire's) subjects, these associations must have been of the highest importance, as they also endeavored to pursue an uplifting mission for people of low social standing.

One might compare this moving comment on 'ein menschenwürdiges Dasein' with the programs of the earnest 'gentlemen-reformers' of the period. H.G. Wells' Kipps encountered such a man in 'Mr Chester Coote' of the 'Folkestone Young Men's Association,' circa 1905. Mr Coote 'was a young man of semi-independent means, who inherited a share in a house agency, read Mrs Humphry Ward [one of Wells' favorite bêtes noires], and took an interest in social work. . . . To Kipps and his kind in the Young Men's Association he read a stimulating paper on "Self-Help." He said it was the noblest of all our distinctive English characteristics, and he was very much down upon the "over-educated" Germans.'[28] (One presumes he would have considered Liebenam an exception to this general rule.)

Nonetheless, the *Zur Geschichte* . . . reflects an identical—albeit rather bourgeois—notion of social justice, a sentiment that was the fruit of its unique place and time. Even Pope Leo XIII was to make a compelling case, in the *Rerum Novarum* of May 1891, for the burden incumbent upon the state, the Church, and lay organizations, as well as trade unions, to strive for real social progress.[29] Such sentiments put the Church hierarchy at odds with some of its most ardent partisans, especially those who remained loyal to the policies, both theological and political, of Pius IX. (See above, Chapter 1, for G.B. De Rossi's difficulties during the transition to this new pontificate.) However, *Rerum Novarum* also made it possible for a new understanding of Christian responsibility to the less fortunate to take root,

---

[27] Liebenam 1890, 41: 'In einer Zeit, wo üppigster Reichthum und tiefste Armuth die Unterthanen schroff schied, mussten Vereine von der grössten Bedeutung sein, welche auch dem gesellschaftlich Niedrigstehenden ein menschenwürdiges Dasein zu schaffen bestrebt waren.'

[28] *Kipps: The Story of a Simple Soul* [Wells 1905], 54.

[29] Newman 1967, 12, 136–137.

allowing Catholics to advocate the amelioration of working conditions for industrial laborers without resorting to the strictures of Marxism. While refuting the materialism of a socialist solution to industrial problems, the Pope insisted that both the Church and the State were obliged to aid the working classes. In fact, he argued that the State ought to see that employees were fairly compensated, that their demands were met before a strike was called, and that property be distributed as fairly and widely as possible. The final section of *Rerum Novarum* even emphasized the societal benefits that could result from the work of voluntary associations, such as Church groups and labor unions. With this official endorsement from the highest rung of the Church hierarchy, there resulted movements of 'Christian Democracy' and even a 'Christian Socialism' that flourished in many Western European countries and would swell into a potent political force throughout the twentieth century.

The four volumes (a total of nearly 1500 printed pages) of J.-P. Waltzing's *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains, depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'Occident*, appearing between 1895 and 1900, are shot through with precisely this brand of 'Christian Democracy'. We cannot divorce this seminal work from its context, the Belgium (and specifically the industrial center of Liège) of the 1890s, a society at the forefront of European social and economic development. Despite the full century that has passed, Waltzing's remains the standard book on the subject, but its provenance and surroundings are rarely considered when its sentiments and argumentation are quoted today. Nevertheless, the cultural milieu of the *Étude* was a direct influence on how the book was composed, and it was designed to address timely, as well as timeless, concerns.

Born in 1857 in Arlon, very near the eastern edge of Francophone Belgium, Waltzing was the cousin of the distinguished medievalist Godefroid Kurth, to whom he would later dedicate the first volume of his *Étude*.[30] True to his name and the slight 'Arlonais' accent 'that was a bit fatiguing for some liégois ears,' according to one of his biographers,[31] Waltzing's scholarship seemed the ideal combination

[30] When a Festschrift was created in Kurth's honor in 1908, Waltzing was among both the Comité exécutif and the Comité de publication. See Mélanges 1908, I, xviii.

[31] Hubaux 1929, 2: 'Toute sa vie, il devait garder un fort accent arlonais qui rendait son élocution un peu fatiguante pour des oreilles liégoises.' Hubaux has-

of Germanic rigor and Latin intuition.[32] He began his association with the Université de Liège in 1879, and would remain there, despite the depredations brought by the Great War,[33] until his death in 1929.[34] The course of his life's work would, however, be determined by a special commission he received from the Académie Royale de Belgique in 1887, for completion of an 'étude historique sur l'organisation, les droits, les devoirs et l'influence des corporations d'ouvriers et d'artistes chez les Romains.'[35] That the Academy would have requested such a work reveals the extent to which such ideas were percolating under the surface in the Belgian national temper. However, the decision to charge Waltzing with the task was an inspired one; he brought to the project not only a rigorously 'scientific' method, but also a profound conviction of the subject's relevance to modern society.

We may see hints of these ideas in Waltzing's work as early as 1891, when he reviewed Liebenam's *Zur Geschichte . . .*, for the *Revue de l'instruction publique en Belgique*. The review begins with five full pages of corrections and additions to Liebenam's epigraphic corpus. His critique was so thorough that it seems likely he had already completed the bulk of the mammoth catalog that would become the *Étude*'s third volume. At any rate, his mastery of Orelli and similar compilations of inscriptions, as well as of the then-available volumes

tened to add that, while some *thought* Waltzing's first language was German, this was not the case. In fact, he had had difficulty, throughout his life, in learning German, and was far more comfortable in Italian. (One should probably not press the point too hard, of course; it was certainly a reasonable desire, in 1920s Belgium, to distance Waltzing from any hint of a German background.)

[32] Dubuisson 1990, II, 389: '. . . il en partage le souci germanique de rigueur, de prudence et d'érudition exhaustive, mais aussi la dimension plus latine de perspective culturelle et d'humanisme.'

[33] Liège was the site of the first aerial bombardment in history (6 August 1914), and its University was the scene of one of the earliest and most shocking massacres of civilians in World War I. On the nights of 19 and 20 August 1914, more than 60 civilians were shot in a series of incidents, culminating in a mass execution at the Place de l'Université. For relevant documents, see Zuckerman (2004, 26) and Horne and Kramer (2001, 25).

[34] In his obituary for his former teacher, Alphonse Roersch drew particular attention to Waltzing's experiences during the War, and his sympathy and concern for his students who had perished in it. Recalling a visit to Waltzing's office in December 1918, Roersch noticed that, while his old professor was surrounded by his books, as was his habit, he still had time to show pictures of his former students, framed on the walls. Roersch adds, 'Avec quelle émotion le vieux maître me montra ces braves qui étaient bien les fils de son esprit!' [Roersch 1934, 126].

[35] Dubuisson 1990, II, 389.

of *C. I. L.*, is astonishing. After listing all of Liebenam's omissions, he commented, in the trenchant and witty style that would characterize his later work:[36]

> On le voit, la liste de M. Liebenam est loin d'être complète. . . . Le travail de M. Liebenam se ressent d'une trop grande hâte; disons cependant à sa décharge qu'il a été le premier à l'entreprendre, et qu'en pareille matière les erreurs et les oublis sont inévitables.

Thus, Waltzing recognized that Liebenam had done a great service by describing the *collegia* inscriptions as a distinct set and by contributing the first full-scale study of the social phenomena that had produced them. He had just been too hasty and careless in his exposition of the texts.

Nonetheless, in this piece, Waltzing endorsed the core definition of *collegia* advanced by Liebenam. The purpose of such organizations was:[37]

> [R]endre la vie plus agréable en facilitant les rapports entre les gens de même condition (Pflege der Geselligheit [sic]),[38] secours mutuels et culte d'une même divinité. On ne parle pas d'un but économique, ni de la protection du métier, ni de la conservation des procédés, ni de l'exercice d'une industrie en commun. Nous souscrivons à cette opinion, sauf en ce qui concerne les secours mutuels.

This 'exception' would continue to trouble Waltzing as he delved further into the collegial phenomenon, and he repeatedly dealt with the subject in his published work. For instance, in the midst of writing the individual volumes of the *Étude historique*, Waltzing compiled a list of attestations of 'funerary colleges, properly called,' sorted them by find-spot, and commented on their general significance, within the larger group of *collegia* inscriptions.[39]

Such a list shared much in common with Schiess', but, when it came to his own analysis of the full data related to *collegia*, Waltzing was determined to proceed with all deliberate speed—not with unwarranted haste, but rather with truly scientific precision. It is important to note how often Waltzing classed epigraphy, and his own

[36] Waltzing 1891, 165–166.
[37] Waltzing 1891, 173.
[38] The printer's (?) error is probably due to confusion of the German 'Geselligkeit' with the Dutch 'gezelligheid.' [Many thanks to Prof. Onno van Nijf for this suggestion.]
[39] Waltzing 1898/9.

approach to it, as a *science*, and an absolutely critical one for the entirety of classical studies. In 1892, Waltzing published a lesson plan—and a defense of epigraphy as a legitimate field of study—for his University, entitled *L'épigraphie latine et les corporations professionnelles de l'empire Romain.*[40] Inaugurating a new course in Latin epigraphy for his students, he insisted that epigraphy was not merely an ancillary tool available to 'real' classicists, i.e. philological researchers. In fact, he argued, 'Toutes les branches de la philologie classique sont plus ou moins ses tributaires . . .' (10). Though 'a new science,' and perhaps also the latest to appear, of all the sciences that constitute classical philology, epigraphy was, in his estimation, fully capable of being mastered as a scientific field in its own right. Given the general theme of the oration, it is surely no accident that 'sciences' is its third word.

As has often been the case, the classics were under siege in the 1890s, within the walls of Waltzing's own, as within many other, institutions. In this light, he had apparently decided that one way to deflect the invaders was to insist, to an age obsessed with science and its potential benefits for the community, upon the scientific quality of what he was doing. Dubuisson notes that, while Waltzing was widely known to be a 'champion of the modernizing of the University's programs, . . . he remained an unwavering defender of the ancient languages, which were already menaced in that period. . . .'[41] In a speech to a commission that was attempting to reform the curriculum throughout the country in 1912, Waltzing insisted that the study of Greek and Latin must be preserved in the modern university, for a myriad of reasons, including the fact that 'Greco-Roman civilization is the mother of modern civilization.'[42] Even in these battles, he was determined to apply scientific means and terminology to carry the point. Attempting to reform pronunciation of Latin, though only in certain classes, he argued, 'If we have taken care to assign, as far as the state of the science permits, the ancient pronunciation (that which one calls scientific), we are very far from recommending it in

[40] Waltzing 1892a [a pamphlet in the holdings of Bibliothèque of the Université de Liège].

[41] Dubuisson 1990, II, 390: 'Partisan d'une modernisation des programmes—et en particulier, on l'a vu, de l'introduction des auteurs chrétiens—, il reste un défenseur inconditionnel des langues anciennes, déjà menacées à l'époque, parfois par ceux-là mêmes qu'on eût pu croire leurs défenseurs naturels.'

[42] Waltzing 1913, 52f.

the Humanities classes, the goal of which is not at all to educate scholars.'[43] Throughout his career, then, Waltzing insisted that antiquarian scholarship be refitted to meet the demands of a scientific age, but he also made clear that exacting philological and epigraphic research could, in a very real sense, be 'scientific' endeavors in their own right.

This was not the only reason that epigraphic study in general, and detailed analysis of the Roman *collegia* in particular, were desiderata at this precise moment in time. In his inauguration of the course, Waltzing insisted that the study of professional corporations was not an outmoded pursuit, but instead a subject fully au courant in the present. 'All eyes today,' he observes, 'are turned toward the working class: the most profound thinkers, the most adept politicians, the most untiring laborers, search for a solution of that which it has become conventional to call the worker question, or even the social question.'[44] If such subjects are deemed important today, therefore, would it not be sensible to turn to their counterparts in the past, to discover parallels that may be helpful to us in solving a pressing social problem? However, before Mommsen and his associates had compiled the *Corpus*, the answers to these questions were simply impossible to obtain. 'Where do we find, for example, the particulars on the life of the popular classes, for which we are so eager today?' Naturally, we in the modern world wish to know more about the craftsman, the average, the ordinary worker. For a few examples, one would like to understand 'his pitiable existence, the lengths he went to to escape it, the corporations he founded to make his life easier and more agreeable, the actual role he came to play because of the association—all of this would be a mystery to us without the inscriptions.'[45]

---

[43] Roersch 1934, 124, quoting Waltzing's own statements (in 1924) to this effect, '"Si nous avons pris soin d'indiquer, autant que l'état de la science le permet, la prononciation antique (celle qu'on appelle scientifique), nous sommes très loin de la recommander dans les classes d'Humanités, dont la mission n'est nullement de former des savants."'

[44] Waltzing 1892a, 11: 'Le sujet [les corporations professionnelles], vous le voyez, est d'une haute actualité. Tous les regards sont tournés aujourd'hui vers la classe des travailleurs: les penseurs les plus profonds, les politiques les plus habiles, les hommes d'oeuvres les plus infatigables cherchent la solution de ce qu'il est convenu d'appeler la question ouvrière ou même la question sociale.'

[45] Waltzing 1892b, 11: 'Où trouvons-nous, par exemple, sur la vie des classes populaires, les détails dont nous sommes si avides aujourd'hui? L'artisan, l'ouvrier était méprisé presque à l'égal de l'esclave: sa misérable existence, les efforts qu'il

After receiving his commission from the Académie Royale, Waltzing set about solving this mystery, and the most remarkable result, in the multi-volume work that resulted from his labors, is probably its third volume, a comprehensive catalog of all the inscriptions that were created by or mentioned a *collegium*, arranged in *C. I. L.* order. The fourth volume, appearing in 1900, was a useful index of the *collegia*, by type, cross-indexed in multiple indices that are still essential starting-points for making the most efficient use of the catalog. However, before publishing these reference items, Waltzing also prepared two volumes of narrative, explaining the historical development of the *collegia* in the Roman world—together with extensive analysis of their activities with regard to their own membership and to their larger communities—throughout the centuries of their development. The general arrangement is chronological, as the first volume deals with the birth, legal standing, and internal operations of the *collegia* in the Empire, from the Regal and Republican periods through, roughly, the third century CE. The second volume carries on from this point, tracing the gradual decline of the *collegia*, as they became 'official institutions' under State control and lost their traditional freedom of action.[46]

The introduction to the first portion of the work sets its tone, and develops, in succinct detail, the ideas he had articulated in the materials cited above. Whereas, he claims, previous historians could only comment on battles and grand political events, constrained by the biases and interests of elite sources, present-day classicists can draw on a rich new vein of sources, now conveniently compiled in indexed volumes. In a rich—and Biblically-inspired—image, he argues that 'the mute stones' are now crying out, and that they 'reveal to us a thousand details on which the historians keep silent.'[47] He then offers

faisait pour y échapper, les corporations qu'il fondait pour rendre sa vie plus facile et plus agréable, le rôle même qu'il parvenait à jouer grâce à l'association, tout cela serait un mystère pour nous sans les inscriptions.'

[46] This structure can be discerned by examining the three 'parts' into which the two volumes are arranged, i.e. 'Première partie: Le droit d'association à Rome,' 'Deuxième partie: Les collèges professionnels considérés comme associations privées,' and 'Troisième partie: Les collèges professionnels comme institutions officielles.' The first volume is composed of the first two parts, and it is still shorter (by nearly 100 pages) than the second volume, which addresses the third.

[47] Waltzing 1895a, I, 4: 'Longtemps muettes, parce qu'elles étaient enfouies dans les ruines des villes antiques, elles nous révèlent mille détails sur lesquels les historiens gardent le silence.' Waltzing probably had in mind the triumphal entry of Christ, and his comment on it, as recorded in Luke 19:40.

a brief account of the birth, flourishing, and demise of the collegial experience in Rome, followed by a frank reflection on the contemporary relevance of his subject. While the question of professional associations is of great importance today, he avers—though not very strongly—that he has been careful to leave modern concerns to one side. Nevertheless, he observes, 'The facts that we shall lay out, without subtle purpose, are eloquent enough by themselves, and it will be easy for the reader to extract the conclusions from them, without ever losing sight of the difference of the eras: "it will not be without benefit to have gained insight into those things that appear, at first sight, trivialities, but from which the movements of great matters often spring."'[48] As will become clear, the 'great movement' Waltzing has in mind is the collapse of Roman industry, under the weight of state intervention in the mechanisms of free association. And the 'warning' is directed to a monarch who, by common consent, shared much with his more tyrannical predecessors in the Roman Empire.

Throughout the work, Waltzing is careful to stress the anodyne nature of workers' associations in the Roman world, and the 'familial life' these communities shared. In the section headed 'But privé des collèges professionnelles,' he draws attention to their religious, funerary, charitable, and social activities, which, at least in the texts we possess, clearly eclipse any economic or trade-oriented character to their meetings. While veering away from any explicit discussion of their economic interests in organizing and assembling together on a periodic basis, Waltzing notes, 'It would be interesting to know *if* the workers ever had recourse to violent means and *if* strikes, for example, were known in the Roman world [emphasis added].'[49] Quickly dismissing a piece of evidence, a curious inscription from Magnesia that might hint at action of this sort, he claims that workers had a great deal more to gain, in personal, social, and cultural

---

[48] Waltzing 1895a, I, 16: 'Ajoutons enfin qu'en étudiant cette question des corporations professionnelles, que notre époque a remise à l'ordre du jour, nous avons laissé de côté toute préoccupation moderne. Les faits que nous exposons sans arrière-pensée sont assez éloquents par eux-mêmes, et il sera facile au lecteur d'en tirer les conclusions, sans jamais perdre de vue la différence des temps: *non sine usu fuerit introspicere illa, primo aspectu levia, ex queis magnarum saepe rerum monitus oriuntur* [Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.32].' [The 'tamen' between 'non' and 'sine' has been omitted in his quotation.]

[49] Waltzing 1895a, I, 191: 'Il serait intéressant de savoir si les travailleurs n'avaient jamais recours aux moyens violents et si les grèves, par exemple, étaient connues dans le monde romain.'

terms, from merely assembling than they ever had from acting in concert for economic interests. (This would, at least in his estimation, be an anachronistic expectation, in any event.)

That workers should organize in groups is, either in the past or the present, only natural, he argues, since 'ils ont en tout temps préféré s'unir à des ouvriers de la même industrie.' Moreover, we human beings, in every place and time, 'like to associate ourselves with people of similar occupations, of equal social conditions, who have the same ideas and interests.'[50] Here, as throughout the *Étude*, he stresses the obvious advantages of 'la vie familiale dans les collèges.' After the work-week is done, people instinctively and spontaneously enjoy coming together and sharing in their accustomed 'divertissements,' making their lives 'easier and more pleasant.'[51] Whether in Rome or in Liège, workers do not actually desire to assemble, on their days off, to discuss collective bargaining, poor working conditions, or higher wages. Rather, they are merely seeking a break from the daily routine, a chance to divert their attention and 'improve their minds.' Shades of Mr Coote loom in this charming sentence: 'Il se forme aujourd'hui parmi les ouvriers, le plus souvent par l'initiative d'hommes d'une classe plus élevée, des associations qui procurent avant tout à leurs membres des récréations honnêtes aux jours de repos' (I, 322).

So successful were these sociable organizations that they actually came to supplement, and even to *replace*, natural familial bonds. In fact, 'The community of industry and of interests replaced the ties of blood, and did not the "confrères" possess, like the family, their common cult, their common meals, their common burial place?'[52] Waltzing reminds the reader that s/he has already seen instances in which, in both religious and funereal contexts, the colleges acted just like families, celebrating their 'dear parent' and the cult of their common dead. Moreover, this sentiment expressed itself in physical terms, as they attempted to preserve the unity and spirit of fraternity throughout life and into death. For example, 'They hoped, we have already seen, to rest one day in the same tomb or at least side by side; for

[50] Waltzing 1895a, I, 265.
[51] Waltzing 1895a, I, 322.
[52] Waltzing 1895a, I, 322: 'La communauté du métier et des intérêts remplaçait les liens du sang, et les confrères n'avaient-ils pas, comme la famille, leur culte commun, leurs repas communs, leur sépulture commune?'

the time being, they sat together at the same table in their common house [the *schola*].'[53] Even the most cursory reading of their inscriptions reveals the extent to which familial terminology penetrated into these non-familial groups, as '*frater*', '*pater*', '*mater*', and '*soror*' were used to describe the relationships that had sprung up among them, and there is no indication that these were terms deriving from blood ties among the membership (I, 329). Even if we are prepared to see them as primarily professional organizations, their natural inclination would have been to protect the interests of the entire group, creating a sense of 'their interior life', which, necessarily, played a salient role in their assembly (I, 333).[54]

This general sense of concern and mutual regard expressed itself in their interior organization, and the apportionment of offices and duties among their membership. In his chapter entitled 'Organisation des collèges professionnels en vue du but privé,' he draws particular attention to the 'Autonomie intérieure des collèges,' which resulted in a noticeably egalitarian spirit in their magistracies and pronouncements. Despite the hierarchies that they employed and respected, 'equality existed, in the sense that all were admissible to their offices.'[55] The *collegium*, he insists, 'was a family, but it was also a republic, a city. [As a] citizen of the town, the worker did not have a great deal to say, [but as a] member of the college, he was the equal of his confrères.'[56] These mini-societies resembled 'a small organized republic,' or a small city, with their own administrative structures in place, but a general notion of fraternity and familial respect also served to undergird their connection (I, 514). Nothing in their fundamental approach to communal life and communal joys posed any

[53] Waltzing 1895a, I, 322: 'Nous avons vu que leurs fêtes religieuses ou funèbres étaient celles des familles: comme elles, ils célébraient la "chère parenté" et le culte des morts. Ils espéraient, nous l'avons vu encore, reposer un jour dans la même tombe ou du moins côte à côte; en attendant, ils s'asseyaient à la même table dans leur maison commune.'

[54] Crucial to this analysis was Waltzing's attention to women mentioned in the context of the *collegia*. V.E. Hirschmann has recently compared Waltzing's frequent reference to women and their roles in this 'interior life' with their virtual omission by Franz Poland, in his contemporaneous work on associations in the Greek East. See Hirschmann 2004, 402.

[55] Waltzing 1895a, I, 368: 'Malgré cette hiérarchie, l'égalité existait en ce sens que tous étaient admissibles aux fonctions.'

[56] Waltzing 1895a, I, 513: 'Le collège était une famille, mais il était aussi une république, une cité. Citoyen de la ville, l'ouvrier n'avait pas grand'chose à dire, membre du collège, il était l'égal de ses confrères.'

sort of threat to the real power structures in their towns and provinces. Thus, it should be no surprise at all that the emperors cared so little to impose suffocating restrictions on them—at least during the early centuries CE.

These points lead directly to the second major theme that Waltzing sounds throughout both volumes of his narrative concerning collegial life: under ideal conditions, the Roman state deliberately *chose* not to intervene in the free assembly of its workers. It was in no one's interest to stifle or harass them; their simple, honorably-intentioned desire to assemble posed no threat to government control. Rather, this desire motivated them to work harder and improve the general economic standing of the Empire than they would have, if left to their individual families and limited pursuits. Here Waltzing seems, at first blush, to be allowing a serious blemish into his rosy portrait, as a substantial portion of the evidence we have for *collegia* (including the Lanuvian inscription) alludes to government sanctioning and licensing of these groups. How are the two positions to be reconciled? Waltzing claims that what *appears* to be government intervention is only cosmetic, with very limited goals in mind, most of them occasioned by the Clodian interlude in the 50s BCE.[57] At that time, political gangs had *masqueraded as* legitimate *collegia*, which were known in Rome from at least the time of Numa Pompilius, and this experience had raised a reasonable fear among the emperors of the first two centuries CE. However, even in its most intrusive sense, this regulation was extremely mild, for, 'This control did not concern itself besides with the interior organization of the corporations; it left them free, provided that they did not disturb the public peace.'[58]

Moreover, the evidence of collegial inscriptions underscores the point that these authorizations were easy to obtain, and were probably little more than mildly annoying bureaucratic formalities. Given the attestations of so many *collegia* in the third century, for example, it is clear that this authorization was not difficult to obtain, and—in a very telling point—we have no evidence of *unauthorized* associations, clamoring unsuccessfully for state sanction. Indeed, this should not be surprising, given the emperors' short- and long-term interests

[57] On this subject, see especially Linderski 1968.

[58] Waltzing 1895a, I, 127–128: 'Ce contrôle ne concernait du reste pas l'organisation intérieure des corporations; on les laissait libres, pourvu qu'elles ne troublassent pas la paix publique.'

in promoting working-class associations, whose only goal was to make their members' lives a little less miserable. 'The emperors, from early on, appreciated that they could only gain from the creation of new colleges; these were the furnaces of labor, where they found the limbs necessary for diverse branches of the central and municipal administration, or, at the very least, they saw that the association, in unleashing [these] forces, ought to assist in the development of useful industries.'[59]

In these centuries, *collegia* were free to enroll whomever they wished, to select their own officers, and to offer dedications to whatever patrons they chose to honor with their connection (I, 335–337). Even on the rare occasions in which an emperor or governor intervened in the process (by licensing or recognizing the association in some way), he never attempted to regulate the college's interior workings.[60] As a consequence, a great variety of internal arrangements became the norm, throughout the Empire, and the laissez-faire attitude of governmental authorities made the *collegium* more and more attractive to a larger subset of industrial workers (I, 339). The inevitable result of this was immense goodwill toward the emperor, expressing itself in general and heartfelt gratitude to the leader who had allowed them to be free in this regard. Such enthusiasm was natural, 'because [the *collegia*] demonstrated the loyalty of the popular classes and their attachment to the Empire.' As demonstrated by their flattery of the emperor in their collegial decrees, 'the people were satisfied with the imperial regime.'[61] The message is as clear as Waltzing indicated it would be in his introduction: the encouragement of corporate action among workers leads, like a law of nature, to greater worker satisfaction, higher levels of productivity, and deeper loyalty to the regime that has fostered this freedom.

---

[59] Waltzing 1895a, I, 153: 'De plus, les empereurs s'aperçurent de bonne heure qu'ils ne pouvaient que gagner à la création de nouveaux collèges: c'étaient des foyers de travail, où ils trouvaient les bras nécessaires à diverses branches de l'administration centrale et municipale, ou, tout au moins, ils voyaient que l'association, en décuplant les forces, devait favoriser le développement des métiers utiles.'

[60] Waltzing 1895a, I, 337: 'Rarement c'était l'État lui-même, c'est-à-dire l'empereur ou le gouverneur de la province, qui prenait l'initiative; mais même dans ce cas on n'usait pas de contrainte: les membres se faisaient inscrire librement et, pour la poursuite de leur but privé, ils s'organisaient comme ils l'entendaient.'

[61] Waltzing 1895a, I, 494: '. . . parce qu'ils prouvent le loyalisme des classes populaires et leur attachement à l'Empire . . . le peuple était satisfait du régime impérial.'

However, and inevitably, the reverse is also true. Tome II traces out the *decline* of free association, from this admirable height, and the gradual enslavement of workers by the Late Imperial state. With this suppression of workers' freedoms, levels of productivity declined, and, tragically, the Empire (and the Emperors) could not call upon the goodwill of their working citizens when the barbarians made inroads into their territories. By tying workers to their hereditary professions, and by making corporations the engines of the State, the State set upon a dangerous course that would, bit by bit, result in disaster for all. At the beginning, 'It [the State] only interfered warily in their interior affairs; in a word, even while they were becoming more and more official, the corporations did not yet cease to be free.'[62] Nevertheless, the process led in only one direction, to increased intervention by an ossifying and bureaucrat-laden state. Over time, the State extinguished the only real furnace in its productive capacity, by interfering in the colleges' internal arrangements and public actions. 'Therefore, for a long time, private initiative was the only one to found the colleges, even those whose members were devoted to public service; the State intervened little by little, at first to encourage them, then for the purpose of establishing some corporations themselves.'[63]

Thus, all of Roman economic history, at least in the imperial period, can be divided into two eras, 'one of liberty, which lasted a little less than two centuries, and the other of slavery, which began in the course of the third.'[64] By the fourth and fifth centuries, all pretense of economic freedom was dropped, and the predominant conditions were those of 'constraint and hereditary obligation.'[65] The insidious hand of government gradually cast its shadow over the entire society: 'Little by little, this administration, so effectively organized, which had its agents everywhere and blended in everywhere,

---

[62] Waltzing 1896, II, 4: 'Il [l'État] ne s'immisça que discrètement dans leurs affaires intérieures; en un mot, tout en devenant de plus en plus officielles, les corporations ne cessaient pas encore d'être libres.'

[63] Waltzing 1896, II, 255: 'Ainsi l'initiative privée fut longtemps seule à fonder les collèges, même ceux dont les membres étaient au service public; l'État intervint peu à peu, d'abord pour encourager, puis pour établir lui-même des corporations.'

[64] Waltzing 1896, II, 255: 'Il faut distinguer deux périodes: l'une de liberté, qui dura à peu près deux siècles, l'autre de servitude, qui commence dans le cours du troisième.'

[65] Waltzing 1896, II, 259: 'Condition des collèges officiels au IVe et au Ve siècle: CONTRAINTE ET HÉRÉDITÉ.'

covered the Empire entirely.'[66] The Empire itself was transformed 'into a vast workshop, under the control of a throng of functionaries,' where one worked only for the benefit of the State and its needs.[67] Just as freedom had led to joy, loyalty, and progress, so these new constraints led to misery, restiveness, and, ultimately, collapse. 'They [the workers] sacrificed their liberty, they submitted themselves to a hard and pitiable labor, but at least they were secure, under the protection of a powerful master who had need of them! The inevitable consequence, this was the ruin for the cities, the ruin of the Empire.'[68] With the collapse of the Empire, the collapse of the corporative structure followed soon after. The model was lost, and the corporations of the Middle Ages evolved in a completely different way. The economy continued to stagnate, and whatever progress had been made in the Empire melted away under the crushing weight of State control of industry and the individual workers who had made it possible.

In his conclusion, Waltzing sums up this stirring narrative, but he makes it clear that his story has a moral, one that should not be lost on today's industrial societies. At the height of the collegial system, emperors had every reason to encourage corporate action, and to stay their hands with regard to workers' association. In fact, 'Who knows if the goodwill of power toward the poor was not more effective than repression, for drawing out the gratitude of the popular classes, and for attaching them to the Empire.'[69] On the other hand, the decline of the collegial ideal and with it, the Empire's collapse, was 'the fruit of a wretched political constitution and of a vicious economic system.'[70] This being the case, it would seem essential that freedom of choice and freedom of workers' association be preserved, for the benefit of everyone in the society, both great and small. 'Liberty of

[66] Waltzing 1896, II, 261: 'Peu à peu, cette administration si fortement organisée, qui avait ses agents partout et se mêlait de tout, couvrit l'Empire tout entier.'

[67] Waltzing 1896, II, 481: 'L'Empire est donc transformé en un vaste atelier, où, sous le contrôle d'une foule de fonctionnaires, on travaille pour le prince et pour les besoins de l'État et des particuliers.'

[68] Waltzing 1896, II, 340: 'Ils sacrifiaient la liberté, ils se soumettaient à un dur et pénible travail, mais au moins ils seraient en sécurité, sous la protection d'un maître puissant qui avait besoin d'eux! La conséquence inévitable, c'était la ruine pour les villes, la ruine de l'Empire.'

[69] Waltzing 1896, II, 479: 'Qui sait si la bienveillance du pouvoir envers les humbles ne fut pas plus efficace encore que la répression, pour lui attirer la reconnaissance des classes populaires, et pour les attacher à l'Empire.'

[70] Waltzing 1896, II, 481: 'Tel était le régime social, fruit d'une mauvaise constitution politique et d'un système économique vicieux.'

vocation, fair compensation, competition: this is the triple condition of industrial progress. The organization of labor by the State disregarded it.'[71] Restrictions on private initiative can only destroy personal industrial capacity. Thus, commerce will always be overwhelmed, in a simple, logical progression, by excessive State regulation.

While looking for comparisons between the present and the distant past, he adds, one might be tempted to compare 'this vast organization of labor to certain modern theories, which appear to seduce many people.' One wonders here whether he is thinking only of Marxism, of Syndicalism, or of 'Statism' of all kinds. However, he conscientiously withdraws from such speculations to return to his Roman theme. 'We remain on the field of history, and we will confine ourselves to remarking, in concluding, that it was not despotism, not tyranny, not the spirit of domination that animated the Roman emperors.'[72] The lesson is clear: suppression of workers' natural desires to assemble can only be counter-productive, and the risks of such behavior are potentially lethal to the total society. The obvious implication is that present-day 'emperors' ought to follow a more liberal policy regarding corporate action among workers, rather than a policy that would lead to despotism and thereafter to decline.

We should probably recall, in this connection, that Waltzing's king was Léopold II, arguably the most reactionary monarch in Western Europe at that time.[73] In fact, in 1895, this king was actually engaged in a bitter and public altercation with Pope Leo XIII, over unions *in Liège*. The city's Monseigneur Doutreloux had formed a broad coalition of leftist clerics, self-proclaimed 'democrats,' and workers' representatives. Affiliated with national organizations like 'l'Union catholique' and 'l'Union démocratique', the Monseigneur had solidified Liège's reputation as 'une des citadelles du catholicisme social.'[74] One of the practical outgrowths of this approach to social justice was the series of meetings he convened at Liège in 1886, 1887, and 1890,

---

[71] Waltzing 1896, II, 484: 'Liberté de la vocation, récompense équitable, concurrence: voilà la triple condition du progrès dans l'industrie. L'organisation du travail par l'État la méconnaît.'

[72] Waltzing 1896, II, 484: 'Nous resterons sur le terrain de l'histoire et nous ferons seulement remarquer, en finissant, que ce n'étaient pas le despotisme, ni la tyrannie, ni l'esprit de domination qui animaient les empereurs romains.'

[73] The root-causes of the recent massacres in Rwanda may be traced to his personal rule over the Belgian Congo. See Hochschild 1998.

[74] Rezsohazy 1958, 268f. For similar developments in Flemish Belgium, see Hellemans 1990, esp. 105f.

designed 'to ameliorate the moral and material conditions of the laboring class,' according to one biographer.[75] Each 'Congrès social' resulted in published pamphlets and calls for further action. In 1886, he issued a pastoral entitled, pointedly, 'Les devoirs des classes dirigeantes,' and, after the second Congress, a manifesto entitled 'Les devoirs des patrons envers les ouvriers.'[76] Doutreloux welcomed the Pope's attention to the question in 1894, in an episcopal letter commenting on the *Rerum Novarum*, under the title 'Sur la question ouvrière,' in which he insisted on working with and respecting the dignity of working men.[77]

From 1898 until his death in 1901, Doutreloux would go on to participate actively in the 'Ligue démocratique belge,' and he aroused the vociferous opposition of conservative Catholics, the forces typically opposed to the political interests of the working classes, and determined to preserve the unity of the Catholic party in the country at large. Doutreloux objected, in the strongest terms, to this jettisoning of the workers for political advantage, and he thereby incensed a powerful lobby of businessmen in his own and in other cities. As one indicator of these high passions, a Charles Fredeburg wrote an indignant letter to the Pope in 1894, under the challenge, 'Un appel au pape contre Victor-Joseph Doutreloux ci-devant Éveque de Liège.'[78] Léopold himself was so alarmed at developments in Liège that he also wrote an urgent letter to the Pope, demanding that conservative priests be appointed to certain vacant posts in the immediate vicinity.[79] However, he was dealing with the issuer of the *Rerum Novarum*, a man who fully and energetically backed social activists in the Church. To no one's surprise, then, Léopold's request was promptly denied. The end result of this is that Waltzing's call for imperial 'goodwill' would very likely have fallen on deaf ears, were *this* king his intended audience.

It should also be noted that Waltzing, personally, seemed to be appreciative of and influenced by this movement for social reform

[75] Simon 1959, II, 346–347: 'Son activité la plus originale et la plus clairvoyante fut celle qui l'engagea dans les Congrès sociaux de Liège (1886, 1887, 1890). Il voulait améliorer les conditions morales et matérielles de la classe laborieuse. . . .'

[76] Simon 1959; Doutreloux 1887. [The latter is preserved in the Bibliothèque of the Université de Liège.]

[77] Simon 1959, II, 347.

[78] Fredeburg 1900 [also available in the Bibliothèque of the Univ. de Liège].

[79] Rezsohazy 1958, 269.

organized around Doutreloux. Godefroid Kurth, the dedicatee of the first volume of the *Étude*, was, in addition to being his cousin, Waltzing's colleague at the Université and one of the founders of the 'Ligue démocratique'.[80] A study of intellectual developments in this period has identified Doutreloux and Kurth as the leading exponents of the so-called 'Liège School' of Christian democracy, which was enormously influential in Belgium, the Netherlands, and France in the 1890s.[81] Kurth was a frequent contributor to a journal entitled *Le Bien du peuple*, and he was among the influential citizens of Liège who were demanding state intervention into the social and economic conditions of working people.[82] As such, Kurth clearly recognized the importance of a sympathetic state power in improving the lives of the less fortunate. In fact, he dedicated one of his most significant works, *La cité de Liège au Moyen-Age*, to Auguste Beernaert, the Belgian Prime Minister between 1884 and 1894, whose initiatives had 'opened the roads of a new future to Belgium.'[83] Beernaert's tenure corresponded with one of the most important events in the political and social development of Belgium, a workers' demonstration held in Liège in March 1886, to commemorate the fifteenth anniversary of the Paris Commune. The march involved thousands of people, gathered in a central square of the city, and the police arrested several dozen demonstrators. Many other cities experienced similar demonstrations, a sizable portion of which resulted in violence, and Beernaert reacted quickly but moderately to the perilous situation. Castigating the agitators who seemed to be motivating the violence, the Prime Minister nevertheless ordered commissions to study and remedy the conditions of industrial work in the country. Indeed, he even encouraged the King to say, in his speech to Parliament in November 1886, that, 'It is just that the law encompass a most special protection for the poor and the unfortunate.'[84]

While this was the general atmosphere of life in his country in the 1880s and 1890s, there is every indication that this influence

---

[80] Dumont 1974, 97.
[81] Strikwerda 1997, 250.
[82] Stiennon 1991, 218.
[83] Kurth 1909, dedication page: 'À Monsieur Auguste Beernaert au grand homme d'État dont les initiatives géniales ont ouvert à la Belgique les voies d'un avenir nouveau je dédie ce livre, en témoignage d'admiration profonde et de respectueuse amitié.'
[84] Mabille 1997, 179–182.

also extended to Waltzing's immediate surroundings, the university at which he was based. From records preserved at the Université, it appears that students of this era were particularly motivated to aid the laboring classes, and in various creative ways. For example, on 26 January 1895, a concert was organized to provide funds for the insurance of miners in the vicinity of the city, and an 'Association générale des étudiants de l'Université' published a series of reports throughout the 1890s, on themes of assistance to the workers in their midst.[85] Their 'charité' even extended to the workers' families and others caught in the gears of an industrialized economy. On 4 January 1907, a society of law students held a 'Grand Gala' to raise money for babies abandoned by unwed mothers and convicts newly released from prison.[86] Given Liège's heavy reliance on its industrialized sector, and the inspiration offered by a visionary religious leader, it is, perhaps, easy to see why Waltzing's thoughts would have tended toward this subject (and to the government that could, if it chose, harass Belgium's '*tenuiores*').

It also appears that, while Waltzing was writing the *Étude historique*, he was concerned about the more general applications of his work for this laudable social goal. At the Third 'Congrès scientifique international des catholiques', held at Brussels in 1894, Waltzing delivered a lecture entitled 'Les corporations de l'ancienne Rome et la charité'. The overall argument of the oration, which must have pleased his audience, was that the Roman *collegia* could not be described as truly 'charitable' organizations because they were not imbued by the Christian spirit of giving, i.e. without expectation of a reciprocal benefit.[87] This was not possible in Roman society, generally, because Christianity had not yet 'given to the world a superior conception of charity, a charity which not only inspires in men pity for their unfortunate brothers, but obliges them to offer effective

[85] See, for example, a pamphlet published by the University, *Association des élèves des écoles spéciales, salle du consérvatoire royale: concert du 26 janvier 1895 au profit de le caisse de prévoyance des ouvriers mineurs de la province de Liège* [Université de Liège 1895]. (These records are now held in the Bibliothèque of the Université.)

[86] Another University publication, held in the University library, entitled *Association des étudiants en droit. Soirée de Grand Gala organisée au profit de l'oeuvre des enfants moralement abandonnés et des condamnés libérés, 4 janvier 1907* [Université de Liège 1907].

[87] Remarkably, this speech also drew an international audience, as it was translated and published in a journal, based in New York, entitled *The Charities Review* (Waltzing 1895c).

aid and to give themselves to them without counting the cost.'[88] True charity, by this argument, would demand that one give to the less fortunate, regardless of memberhip in the college, and this is something that is simply not documented, in any sense, in the inscriptions. Nevertheless, Waltzing wonders aloud whether Christianity, 'with its rapid spread through the lower classes', could have created truly Christian mutual-help societies within this model.[89] Notice, again, that Waltzing has sketched a hopeful and favorable view of life among the lower classes, though one that could only have been improved, if animated by 'the Christian spirit.'

Thus, Waltzing's analysis would appear to have been designed for a practical, modern application, as an example of 'fraternal' behavior among the lower orders of a dead society. It is also clear that this analysis was, even by his contemporaries, considered the 'final' one on the subject, at least for the foreseeable future. In *The Classical Review*, A.H.J. Greenidge hailed the first volume as 'the most patient and exhaustive treatment of the Roman guilds which has yet appeared,' and not likely to be improved upon, whatever new discoveries may be made. In fact, given its completeness, 'the only function left to an inquirer into the nature of the Roman guilds will be that of conjecture, no doubt a valuable function but one from which the exigencies of his present task have compelled our author to abstain.' Indeed, despite the 'almost painful' wealth of evidence he had adduced, Waltzing was to be praised for 'how manfully the attractions of analogy are resisted' in the book as a whole.[90]

In recognition of the massive quality of this data, scholars in the decades immediately following the appearance of the *Étude historique* could only comment on minor details within it, and connect the *collegia* with other elements of ancient and modern societies. For example, the Austrian Edmund Groag attempted, in 1904, to date the transition from free associations to government suppression of workers'

---

[88] Waltzing 1895b, 168: 'Ils ne songent pas que ces ouvriers vivaient dans une autre société que la nôtre et que le christianisme n'avait pas encore apporté au monde sa conception supérieure de la charité, qui n'inspire pas seulement la pitié pour des frères malheureux, mais oblige de leur prêter une aide efficace et de se donner à eux sans compter.'

[89] Waltzing 1895b, 189: 'Il serait fort intéressant de savoir si les progrès du christianisme, surtout rapides dans les classes inférieures, ne transformèrent pas ces collèges en leur inspirant son esprit nouveau.'

[90] Greenidge 1896, 55 and 50.

assembly more precisely within the third century, all the while praising the 'sharp-sightedness and the minute carefulness of [the *Étude*'s] author.'[91] In his Columbia dissertation in 1910, Max Radin, who would become a prominent specialist on ancient legal history in the century's early decades,[92] followed Waltzing's argumentation, and added only a few new insights, also related to events during the Severan dynasty.[93] In an important 1924 article on religion in Roman associations, Arthur Darby Nock also deferred to Waltzing on many points.[94] While some scholars seem to have missed the significance of Waltzing's work, they were exceptions that proved the general rule. For example, in 1905, Albert Müller commented on the 'Sterbekassen und Vereine mit Begräbnisfürsorge' of the Roman Empire, producing a piece that was completely indebted to Mommsen but was unchanged by Waltzing's nuances.[95]

Nevertheless, Waltzing's became the standard analysis of the *collegia* as soon as its final volume appeared, and his vision of them became the basic one shared by scholars in subsequent decades. However, by the date of Waltzing's death in 1929, the West had 'progressed,' to some extent, along the lines envisioned by people like Kurth and Doutreloux. Socialist, or at least left-leaning, parties had formed governments in most of the major European nations. Further East, revolutionaries had lost patience with the 'Self-Help' approach. The stage was now set for an even more dramatic intervention by governments in the lives of individuals—and not always for 'bienveillant' reasons.

---

[91] Groag 1904, 481.

[92] After completing his degree at Columbia, Radin became a professor of law at the University of California, Berkeley. In addition to his works on specific matters of Roman law, he produced books aimed at non-specialist readers, including *The Lawful Pursuit of Gain* (Radin 1931), and *The Life of the People in Biblical Times* (Radin 1929). In 1936, he was asked to contribute a piece, entitled 'Imperium', to a Festschrift in honor of Salvatore Riccobono, a professor of legal history at Palermo [Radin 1936]. (The irony of a Jewish-American professor's being invited to Fascist Italy at this point can be seen in comparison with Chapter 5, below.)

[93] Radin 1910.

[94] Nock 1924.

[95] Müller (A.) 1905.

CHAPTER THREE

COLLEGIA AND *CORPORATIVISMO* IN FASCIST ITALY

In the Year XII of the Corporative State (1934), the Università di Bari opened a 'Scuola di perfezionamento in studi corporativi,' an institute for legal scholars charged with exploring the historical pedigree of 'Corporativism' and recommending new arenas for its development. Throughout its first two decades, this University, which had been founded in 1922, maintained—or was forced to maintain—close ties with the Fascist regime. When its 'Seminario Giuridico-Economico' was created (by means of a 'solemn ceremony' in the University's *aula magna* on 1 May 1927), Michele Barillari, dean of the Faculty of Jurisprudence,[1] stressed the University's mission on the nation's behalf and praised its 'initiator, mighty in thought and in will, His Excellency the Head of the Government Benito Mussolini.'[2] Moreover, Mussolini's name commonly appeared alongside that of the University, and many of its official publications bore the title 'R. Università di Bari "Benito Mussolini"' or 'R. Università degli Studi "Benito Mussolini"'.[3] In a lecture opening the 1937–8 academic

[1] Barillari had taught at Bari since the year of its founding, and elsewhere for at least five years previously. In 1937, he was accorded a Festschrift in honor of his '20th year of instruction', and the resulting work, in two volumes, was compiled by the Seminario Giuridico-Economico and entitled *Studi in onore di Michele Barillari* [Studi 1937]. In recognition of Barillari's interests in the intersection of economics and law, and specifically in the emerging 'discipline' of 'Corporative Law', the majority of the items in the collection dealt with these matters. [An important exception, though, is F.M. De Robertis' contribution, 'La convalescenza delle donazioni fra coniugi nelle "orationes" di Severo e Caracalla' (De Robertis 1937).]

[2] Barillari 1927, 4: '. . . ma pure, e sopra tutto, a quelle esigenze profonde dell'anima nazionale da cui procede la fondazione dell'Università di Bari, come una delle più grandi opere di civile rinnovamento, alle quali intende, iniziatore potente di pensiero e di volontà, Sua Eccellenza il Capo del Governo Benito Mussolini.' According to the 'Notiziario' on p. 198 of this volume, 'Il Seminario Giuridico Economico fu inaugurato il 1. maggio 1927 con una solenne cerimonia che coincise con quella della benedizione dei Crocifissi dell'aula magna dell'Università e del locale del Seminario stesso.'

[3] The title page of the first volume of the *Annali* reads, 'R. UNIVERSITÀ DI BARI "BENITO MUSSOLINI"', and that of the following item reads, 'R. UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI "BENITO MUSSOLINI" BARI'. The cover of the University's *Rivista* named the 'R. Università degli Studi "Benito Mussolini"',

year, the Secretary of the GUF (Gruppi Universitari Fascisti = Fascist University Groups),[4] Vito Brandonisio, reminded those assembled of the responsibility, as well as the honor, they derived from this nomenclature, and he argued that the University did not exist for itself or for its students, but rather for the best interests of the State as a whole. He concluded the oration by insisting that it was necessary for the scholars and students to advance in their work, 'sempre più avanti,' to the point that the title was 'not only a privilege, but something deserved, a merit that the same great Head may recognize, and that is an ideal conquest, a solemn journey toward the future.'[5]

In its first year, the faculty of the Seminario began publishing its own *Annali*, and, under the leadership of its director Gennaro Maria Monti, a respected specialist in medieval law codes and religious organizations,[6] they addressed both historical and contemporary matters. For example, one may find in this publication, in addition to detailed analyses of specific points of Roman law, articles entitled 'Il principio corporativo,' published in 1935, and 'Gli equilibri volontaristici nella teoria economica del corporativismo,' in 1938.[7] The study of Corporativism was clearly a priority within Bari's Seminario (and, after a change of name in 1938, the 'Facoltà di Giurisprudenza'), but, in this respect, Bari was not unique among institutions of higher learning throughout the country. In his famous essay on Benedetto Croce, Momigliano observed, 'There was also plenty of intelligence among the young men who led the new "corporativist" movement, but they never learned enough economics to face a Cambridge economist. . . .'[8]

---

and a photo of its third issue (dated 1934) may be viewed at http://www.library.wisc.edu/libraries/dpf/Fascism/Education.html.

[4] Fossati 1998.

[5] Brandonisio 1938, 27: 'Credo sia venuto il tempo di dichiarare che la denominazione di Benito Mussolini, di cui la nostra Università altamente si onora, sia non soltanto un insigne ed invidiabile ornamento esteriore, ma un titolo di maggiore responsabilità per tutti. Nel nome di Benito Mussolini la [sic] Università Adriatica deve non soltanto dire a sè stessa che indietro non si torna, ma che è necessario andare avanti, sempre più avanti, là dove la denominazione sia non solo un privilegio, ma un merito, un merito che lo stesso grande Capo ci riconosca, e che sia conquista ideale, viatico solenne per l'avvenire.'

[6] Among his publications in this period were *Le corporazioni nell'evo antico e nell'alto medio evo: Lineamenti e ricerche* [Monti 1934] and *Le Confraternite Medievali dell'Alta e Media Italia* [Monti 1927]. (There is still a 'Biblioteca Gennaro Maria Monti' at the Università di Bari, in which materials relating to medieval law are currently housed.)

[7] De Simone 1935 and Di Nardi 1938.

[8] Momigliano [1994], 86.

While never a viable nor an internationally respected concept, Fascist Corporativism was, in Mussolini's estimation, one of the 'most innovative' and 'most revolutionary' creations of the regime, an entirely new model for economic relations among the nation's various social classes.[9] Addressing the 'Assembly of the National Council of Corporations' on 13 November 1933, Mussolini read out a resolution he had composed, defining the corporation as 'the instrument which, under the aegis of the State, carries out the integral, organic and unitarian regulation of production with a view to the expansion of the wealth, political power, and well-being of the Italian people.'[10] As the vagueness of this definition suggests, the precise meaning of 'Corporativism' was subject to a myriad interpretations, shifting with the political fortunes of the members of the Duce's inner circle. While it was a topic of seemingly endless discussion over the course of the Fascist era, Corporativism, in essence, called for the restructuring of each industry in a vertical pattern, with managers and workers committed to the betterment of the organization as a whole. By these means, selfish, individual, and class-bound interests would be subordinated to the interests of the 'Corporate State', here construed as a 'body' composed of harmoniously functioning 'organs'. At the top of this structure would be an all-powerful State, managing and directing the units of production toward the fullest realization of the national interest.[11]

Of course, this model, for all its theoretical development, was a practical failure, as the regime merely co-opted the units of production and suppressed collective action by industrial workers. These alterations would provide Mussolini with an effective tool to militarize the regime, especially toward the middle and end of the 1930s, but there were already ominous undertones in the speech the Duce issued in November 1933, explaining what the 'National Council' had decided—at his direction. While 'Our State is an organic, human

---

[9] A good overview of the theory and its basic components may be found in Falasca-Zamponi 1997, 130f, and in Cordova 1974. For a collection of relevant documents, see Schwarzenberg 1972.

[10] Mussolini 1935, 9.

[11] For fascinating comparisons between Italian Corporativismo and the New Deal in the United States, see Whitman 1991. Whitman focuses particularly on a treatise by General Hugh Johnson, who was forced to resign as chief of the National Recovery Administration in 1934, while invoking the 'shining name' of Benito Mussolini in his farewell address.

State, desirous of adhering to the realities of life,' certain other realities were imposed on the government to maintain this body. As he noted, 'Corporations mean regulated economy and therefore also controlled economy, for there can be no regulation without control' (21 and 23). The 'Corporations' were planned and organized as early as 1929, and Giuseppe Bottai served as 'Undersecretary to the Minister of the Corporations' between 1926 and 1929. Bottai would become the guiding spirit of this doctrine, such as it was, and it is therefore appropriate that one of his biographers, Alexander J. De Grand, begins this chapter of Bottai's life with an analysis of what, if anything, 'Corporativismo' meant. Drawing attention to the essential emptiness of the concept, he observes:[12]

> Una delle stranezze della politica è la sostituzione della retorica alla realtà. Il fascismo ebbe la tendenza a portare all'eccesso tale sostituzione e in nessun caso questo difetto fu più manifesto come nello sviluppo del sistema corporativo: materia di discussioni interminabili, il cui senso della realtà rimase ai margini della vita autentica del regime.

Despite the nature of this mirage, Corporativism became one of the fundamental props of the Fascist regime, and it was propounded as a sound and relevant system upon which to build a State (which was always capitalized). Nevertheless, perhaps the most interesting aspect of Corporativism was its educational component, the means by which this novel understanding of economic relations was to be taught to the next generation of Fascists. According to Lorenzo Minio-Paluello, who described Fascist education from the vantage-point of the regime's recent demise, Corporativism had become a systematic, and thereby a 'teachable', economic theory, suitable for use in both secondary schools and universities.[13] Studies of 'political economy' increasingly became mere refinements of 'corporative law', and a new set of textbooks was written and disseminated throughout the country. One of the most influential of these was Carlo Costamagna's *Manuale di diritto corporativo italiano*, which was published in 1927 and dedicated to Mussolini, 'creatore dello Stato corporativo.'[14]

---

[12] De Grand 1978, 71.

[13] Minio-Paluello 1946, 168f. Minio-Paluello refused to swear the oath of loyalty to the Fascist regime in 1933, and, after several years of suffering for his stance, was finally able to emigrate to Britain in the spring of 1939. Further, see Losemann 2004.

[14] Costamagna 1927. Between 1930 and 1943, Costamagna was also the editor of the influential journal *Lo Stato*. Further, see Evola [1995].

Thus, Corporativism became one of the most distinctive ideological constructs of the Fascist regime, and its historical antecedents (however tortuously construed), as well as its implementation in the present day, were common topics of study, at Bari as elsewhere. Indeed, the existence of the Scuola at Bari would be a mere historical oddity, were it not for the fact that the most prolific and respected student of the Roman *collegia* in the twentieth century began his career at this university in the 1930s and was associated with it until his death in September 2003.[15] Over the course of a remarkably long career, Francesco Maria De Robertis produced a series of studies of the legal and social context of the *collegia*—the 'fenomeno associativo', as he labeled it—and all the most recent books and articles on the subject bear the clear stamp of his influence.[16]

While his final research concerned the history of Puglia, especially in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages,[17] De Robertis' three major books on the topic are still essential reading for any comprehension of the collegial phenomenon, especially as it touches on legal matters. The first of these was *Il diritto associativo romano dai collegi della Repubblica alle corporazioni del Basso Impero*, published at Bari in 1938, and, over subsequent decades, it was followed by *Il fenomeno associativo nel mondo romano dai collegi della Repubblica alle corporazioni del Basso Impero* (Napoli, 1955) and *Storia delle corporazioni e del regime associativo nel mondo romano* (Bari, 1971). Together with a host of articles on these and other subjects, recently collected in a three-volume—and 1,811-page—publication entitled *Scritti varii di diritto romano*,[18] these books defined the essential matters scholars have since debated, concerning the colleges' legal status and their socio-economic role in the Roman Empire. Frank M. Ausbüttel, in the most recent general monograph on the collegia (*Untersuchungen zu den Vereinen im Westen des römischen Reiches*, Frankfurt, 1982), deviated from a few of De

[15] A conference was held in his honor at the Università di Bari in November 2004, celebrating 'Francesco Maria De Robertis: L'uomo, il docente, lo studioso'. (See below, Chapter 6.)

[16] See especially the work of Cracco Ruggini (1971 and 1973). His work is cited repeatedly in Japella Contardi 1980; Cafissi 1983; and Royden 1988.

[17] In 1998, for example, he published a study of the 13th-century King and Emperor Frederick II (the so-called '*stupor mundi*'), entitled *Federico II di Svevia nel mito e nella realtà* [De Robertis 1998]. Such interest is not surprising, given Bari's tumultuous history in this period and the presence of the famous 'Castello Sveva' that dominates its old city.

[18] De Robertis 1987.

Robertis' conclusions (e.g. 13 and 23), but the latter's works are often the first materials cited in any specialized study of the *collegia*.[19] (See below, Chapter 6.)

At least a portion of this ongoing influence may be attributed to the remarkable consistency of tone and theme one finds in all his published work, over the past six decades. He revisited the topic repeatedly, but in virtually the same terms he did as a young researcher in this school created under the auspices of the Fascist regime. There was not an abrupt shift in his treatment of the subject after Mussolini's fall, and one would be hard-pressed to find any clear connection between his first book and the political context in which it was created. In fact, this quality was remarked upon immediately, once the book was read outside Italy. In his review, published in the *Journal of Roman Studies* in 1942, P.W. Duff observed:[20]

> Some suspicion may be felt in approaching a History of Corporations emanating from Bari, famous for its broadcasts,[21] in the year XVI of the Corporative State. It is hardly likely that the work would have been planned on such a scale under a government less interested in such matters; but it is our pleasant duty to record that the present volume is, with trifling exceptions, admirably free from propaganda.

However, the reviewer would not have been surprised by this 'freedom,' had he read a short piece De Robertis published in *Il diritto del lavoro*[22] in 1934, entitled 'Corporativismo romano e corporativismo fascista.'[23] Given the nature of the journal, and his attachment to the Scuola at Bari, one may presume that De Robertis was asked, encouraged, or cajoled to draw comparisons between the corporative behaviors he was investigating in the Roman world and those

---

[19] Recent works incorporating his arguments include Weber 1993 and Kneissl 1998.

[20] Duff 1942, 129.

[21] Wartime reports from 'Radio Bari,' broadcast to North Africa and the Middle East, became so famous and had such effect that the BBC launched a special effort to counteract their influence. See Monteleone 1976, 156; Lalli 1976; and Papa 1978, 22f.

[22] Giuseppe Bottai, full Minister of the Corporations from 1929 to 1932, was co-editor of this journal, together with Giuseppe Miceli, from 1931 through 1942. Corporativism was, not surprisingly, a perennial subject in its monthly issues, and it was here that Corporativism was analyzed and reanalyzed most systematically. The journal was published at Rome, under the authority of the 'Fondazione di Diritto del lavoro.' ['Diritto del lavoro, Il,' in De Bernardi and Guarracino 1998, 256–257.]

[23] De Robertis 1934a.

being formulated and implemented in his own society.[24] Nevertheless, in this article, he managed to turn the question on its head by advancing two basic arguments. First, he suggested that the new order of society in Italy was so unique, so original, and so comprehensive that one would actually do it a *dis*service by attempting to root out ancient parallels. Moreover, he posited that the general circumstances and concerns of the Romans were utterly incongruous to modern sensibilities regarding the proper role of work in a society. Thus, we should not be disappointed by the limited nature of 'collegiality' in Roman society, and we should press on with the new Risorgimento, i.e. the application of 'Corporativism' to every aspect of Italian life. As will be seen, De Robertis' formulation of these principles, while he was still a very young scholar of 24 years of age,[25] was enormously influential in the veritable renaissance of publications—albeit a renaissance of dubious quality—that characterized the 1930s in Italy.

Nevertheless, at the beginning of this piece, De Robertis clearly felt the need to explain exactly what he meant by 'Corporativismo,' especially in contemporary usage. In this, he had an extremely wide spectrum of definitions from which to choose, even by 1934. A recent attempt to compile a bibliography of all publications on this single economic theory during the Fascist regime resulted in 26 full pages of small print.[26] The various monographs, articles, and pamphlets are organized under headings like 'Ideologia Corporativa', 'Scienza Economica e Corporativismo', and even 'La Teoria del Mercato e la Nozione di Prezzo'.[27]

However, De Robertis—stretching a bit outside of his own field of expertise—relied on a few very recent works, especially those by Agostino Lanzillo, a significant early Fascist thinker and advocate of 'La terza via', one of the short-hand phrases applied to Corporativism to distinguish it from both the Soviet command economy and Western

[24] De Robertis had already contributed an article to this journal in 1932. Entitled 'Contributo alla storia delle corporazioni a Roma: La paternità della "Lex Julia de collegiis",' the article was published in *Il Diritto del Lavoro*, Anno 1932–X, Fascicle 8 [De Robertis 1932].

[25] The frontispiece of De Robertis 1987 lists his birthdate as 2 January 1910.

[26] Mancini et al. 1982, II, 687–713.

[27] One of the more bizarre works, in this very bizarre collection, relies on a series of graphs—plotting 'desire to work' against 'need to work'—to demonstrate how corporatism can maximize national production (Benini [1982]).

laissez-faire capitalism.[28] However, in this choice, De Robertis was treading on dangerous ground, as Lanzillo had been frozen out of the higher echelons of Fascist ideologues as early as 1927, although he continued to publish his reservations as the regime evolved.[29] Apparently unaware of this change in Lanzillo's fortunes, De Robertis adhered to this economist's basic vision of the corporative economy. This concept—which Lanzillo thought was grounded in 'una scienza economica nuova, così come dopo Galilei sorse una fisica nuova'—is succinctly expressed in a lecture he delivered in the fall of 1930.[30] The primary obligation of the State was, in his estimation, to provide 'un maximum di utilità sociale' for the maximum number of people within it. Faced with the prospect of class struggle, the expected by-product of an industrialized economy, the State must, by intervening directly in the private sector, provide 'una superiore visione di interesse generale.' By overcoming the naturally selfish interests of the various social classes, the economic interests of the 'Nation', as a whole, would be enhanced. Therefore, there is nothing to fear in this 'third way', between state socialism (as in the Soviet Union) and untrammeled capitalism (as in the Western democracies), as, 'The cost of corporative organization, and the eventual dispersions of wealth that it is able to effect, will be compensated by a greater social order, by a better justice and by a more solid cohesion of the citizens of all the classes of the State.'[31]

The ultimate precursor of the bulk of this theory was the 'Actualism' proposed by Giovanni Gentile, in the decade prior to the Fascist seizure of power. Gentile had drawn a distinction between the illusory and the true freedom of the individual, arguing that it was only in a collaborative, collective organization that the individual could realize his true interests. 'In the final analysis,' a recent study of Gentile summarizes, 'the true freedom of the individual does not find expression in the primitive pursuit of private interests, but in the collaborative effort to achieve collective ends.'[32] This approach

---

[28] He cites Cutelli 1932, II, 184–185, and Lanzillo 1933b. On Lanzillo's importance in this regard, see Canfora 1989, 261f.

[29] Cordova 1974, 108 and 304, and Roberts 1979, 280.

[30] Reprinted as Lanzillo [1982].

[31] Lanzillo [1982], I, 216: 'Il costo della organizzazione corporativa, e le eventuali dispersioni di ricchezza che potrà determinare, saranno compensate da un maggior ordine sociale, da una migliore giustizia e da una più piena coesione dei cittadini di tutte le classi dello Stato.'

[32] Gregor 2005, 117–118.

led to his elevation of the 'historic State', which is the repository of the collective aspirations of the entire people of which it is constituted. Gentile described the State as the *sine qua non* for life in the modern world, arguing that:[33]

> Liberty is found only in the State and the State is authority. The State is not an abstraction, an entity that descends from heaven and remains suspended in air above the heads of citizens. Rather, it is all one with the personality of the individual, who for that reason must foster, seek out, and recognize the State, knowing that it is that which he has, himself, fashioned.

In fact, he maintained, 'morality and religion, essential elements in every consciousness, must be there,' subordinated to, fused into, and absorbed by the larger State. The modern Fascist State, therefore, is a 'spiritual', as well as a physical, entity charged with attaining the best results for all of its citizens.

These ideas would be crucial to De Robertis, as he wrestled with the applicability of corporative theory to the Roman past. Drawing on Lanzillo and the others, he concluded that Corporativism, as understood and implemented by the Fascists, connotes something more than mere intervention by a state in economic affairs. After all, the communists (of the Soviet Union, presumably) do as much when they direct and coordinate the economic output of their country.[34] Italian Corporativism is a much more comprehensive doctrine, constituting a total and deliberate intervention of the state into all the various aspects of a given society, for the total good of that society. As De Robertis understood it:[35]

> La funzione del corporativismo però, come avremo agio di dimostrare, non si risolve esclusivamente nel momento economico, ma si estende altresì alla politica ed alla morale, esaurendo così nella sua sfera tutto il campo delle attività nazionali.

---

[33] Gentile (G.) [2002], 30–31.

[34] It is likely (though not stated) that he derived this point from Lanzillo's article, 'Antisindacalismo dei Sovieti' [Lanzillo 1933a], which argues that the Bolsheviks had twisted true syndicalist thinking to ensnare the unsuspecting Russian peasantry. Italian syndicalism is a more systematic approach to economics, as he argued: 'Il sindacalismo è dottrina politica ed etica, è azione e idea. Si basa da una parte sulla realtà, in quanto considera criticamente il movimento delle moltitudini nei loro sentimenti e nelle loro tendenze; d'altra parte, in quanto agita una fiaccola di redenzione e di elevamento sociale e morale, è forza spirituale ed è slancio vitale' (198).

[35] De Robertis 1934a, 226 (*).

> The operation of corporativism, however, as we shall have opportunity to demonstrate, does not confine itself exclusively to economic affairs, but, rather, it extends beyond to political and moral matters, encompassing in its purview the entire field of national activities.

Once he had adopted this definition, De Robertis could argue that, as the Fascists' intervention had been so complete and so coordinated, it would be impossible to find a comparable movement in the past. While it is a natural tendency, he concedes, to look back to the past for inspiration and guidance, it would be a mistake 'a mostrare l'ordinamento attuale come innestantesi nel tronco di quello romano' ('to display present-day arrangements as if they were grafted into the trunk of the Roman original').[36] Instead, modern Italians should acknowledge that Fascism, as developed in the present day, is without precedent and without predecessors, and they should, accordingly, take comfort and pride in their paternity:[37]

> . . . il Fascismo ha dato alla Nazione italiana una fisionomia ed un ordinamento affatto nuovi, si che mal si potrebbero nel clima storico-giuridico creato da esso riallacciare le attuali istituzioni a quelle del passato . . . ed il Fascismo deve sentire, come sente, l'orgoglio e la responsabilità delle sue creazioni, affermandone con sicura coscienza l'originale paternità.
>
> Fascism has given the Italian Nation a countenance and a constitution entirely new, so much so that I would be wrong, in the historico-judicial climate created by it, to re-attach today's institutions to those of the past . . . and Fascism ought to feel, as it does feel, pride in and responsibility for its own creations, affirming them with a secure awareness of their original paternity.

While this line of reasoning might have been enough to satisfy the average Party functionary, another was added to solidify the unique historical position of Fascism. The Roman colleges and Italian Fascism were institutions fully of their times, suited to fit the very different social and political concerns of their own societies. In his estimation, 'si trovano a cavallo di due momenti storici diversi ed attingono la loro ragione di essere da opposte concezioni sociali . . .' ('they find themselves astride two different historical moments, and they derive their raison d'être from social conceptions opposed to one another').[38]

[36] De Robertis 1934a, 226.
[37] De Robertis 1934a, 226–227.
[38] De Robertis 1934a, 227.

As developed over the following pages, the essential difference between these two 'peoples' was their understanding of what constitutes a 'public interest'. In the Roman Empire, workers who shared a common trade were allowed (under varying levels of governmental restriction) to assemble and to form small-scale associations with very limited spheres of activity. In the Fascist era, by contrast, all the various orders, occupations, and officials of society are expected to coordinate their activities, in the interest of the entire nation. Reflecting the official line on corporative theory, he writes:[39]

> E ciò per una concezione completamente diversa che si ha nei due sistemi della utilità pubblica: per l'uno essa consisteva nella utilità che poteva rivenire allo stato dalla costituzione corporativa di un certo numero di artigiani esercitanti lo stesso mestiere; per l'altro nella sostituzione della collaborazione alla lotta di classe e nella tutela dell'interesse nazionale della produzione.
>
> And this is due to a completely different conception that exists in the two systems concerning 'public utility': for the one (Roman), this consisted in the 'use' that could redound to the state from the corporative arrangement of a certain number of artisans practicing the same trade; for the other (Fascist), it is found in the substitution of class-cooperation for class-struggle, and in protecting the national interest in (economic) production.

Thus, while the Romans merely tolerated corporative behavior, never allowing it to progress beyond what they considered a dangerous level, the Fascist regime encourages it, as the surest means of improving the total productivity of the nation, thereby raising the quality of life of all Italians. Throughout the essay, De Robertis stresses the vaguely sacral dimensions of modern Corporativism, observing that the Romans never appreciated the fundamentally 'moral and spiritual' value of work, and were thus too materialistic a people to have attempted the reordering of society demanded by the Fascists. The Fascist experiment is not merely economic in nature, for:[40]

> Lo stato fascista, infatti, conscio della enorme importanza che assumono nella vita dell'uomo i fattori morali e spirituali, ha respinte le teorie del materialismo storico e si è assunto il compito della elevazione economica, morale, intellettuale e civica dei lavoratori, delegandone la cura e la realizzazione ai sindacati di categoria.

---

[39] De Robertis 1934a, 230.
[40] De Robertis 1934a, 234.

> The Fascist state, indeed, recognizing the tremendous importance that moral and spiritual factors play in human life, has rejected the theories of historical materialism, and has taken upon itself the task of elevating the economic, moral, intellectual, and civic condition of the workers, delegating its management and realization to the syndicates of various types.

The article concludes with a rhetorical flourish on the privilege of living in the present age, and the new opportunity that lies ahead for Italy and her neighbors. The 'opera del Fascismo' is 'the more complete actualization of the most sacred vow formulated by D'Azeglio after the first days of our Risorgimento,' the famous 'l'Italia è fatta, facciamo gli Italiani.'[41] Italy stands on the verge of an utterly novel and important moment in her long history, committed to 'una grande e consapevole costruzione' ('a grand and consciously designed construction') that is 'una fiaccola fulgidissima di luce per gli altri popoli, che sembrano avere smarrita la traccia del loro cammino' ('a brightly shining torch of light for the other peoples, who seem to have lost their way').[42]

The appearance of this essay may have freed De Robertis from making similarly ideological remarks in the book Duff would examine several years later. In fact, upon reading *Il diritto romano* . . ., one is struck by how very similar it is, in theme, argumentation, and basic conclusions, to what is still (after a full century) the standard analysis of the *collegia*, in all their aspects, Waltzing's *Étude*. Oddly, after three decades of rapid social, economic, and political change, De Robertis could still describe the collegial impulse in terms virtually identical to Waltzing's, whose *Étude* he deemed 'uno studio poderosissimo.'[43] However, it is also clear that De Robertis assented to Waltzing's political ideals as much as to his scholarly arguments. In *Il diritto associativo romano*, he expresses the greatest satisfaction with the social development of the West as a whole, and not merely of Italy, over the past several decades, '[r]ealizzando forse una forma di liberalismo politico e di liberismo economico che trova il suo

---

[41] De Robertis 1934a, 234. (His quotation of Massimo D'Azeglio's remark is more a paraphrase than a literal rendition. The appeal has been quoted in many versions, including, 'l'Italia è fatta, ora bisogna fare gli italiani' and 'l'Italia è fatta, si tratta di fare gli italiani.')

[42] De Robertis 1934a, 237. Notice the similarity of language between this statement and Lanzillo's, n. 34, above.

[43] De Robertis 1938, 277, n. 2.

riscontro solo in alcuni stati europei del principio di questo secolo' ('realizing, perhaps, a form of political liberalism and of economic freedom that finds its match only in a few European countries from the beginning of this century').[44]

It is this respect for political and economic liberalism, especially in its connections to Christianity,[45] that most clearly distinguished De Robertis from many lesser Italian scholars in the 1930s. Even by 1934, he was acknowledged by his colleagues as a leading authority on the *collegia*, at their point of fullest development.[46] In his study of corporative thought throughout the Middle Ages, G.M. Monti deferred to him, and chose instead to focus his attention on late antique *corpora* and early medieval guild systems.[47] Nonetheless, there were several other general histories of the corporative ethos available to De Robertis, prior to and contemporaneous with the publication of his own articles and books. The identification of the many, and generally inconsequential, books on the collegial phenomenon has been made far easier in recent years with the appearance of Luciana Frangioni's comprehensive bibliography, entitled *Corporazioni e Dintorni: Saggio bibliografico sulle corporazioni e i gruppi professionali dall'età romana alla fascista (e oltre)*.[48] As the subtitle reveals, a substantial proportion of the 8725 items in the bibliography was produced in the context of the Fascist regime, and, given the large number that touch on Roman themes, one can confidently reconstruct the trends that characterized 'scholarly' endeavor on the subject, especially in the 1930s.

This reconstruction leads to two general conclusions, both of which relate to the article De Robertis composed in 1934, and the impact it exerted in the remaining years of the decade. In the first instance, De Robertis' argument concerning the originality of the Fascist vision

---

[44] De Robertis 1938, 263, n. 78.

[45] He maintained a strong interest in medieval confraternities into quite recent years. See, for two examples, De Robertis 1989 and De Robertis 1995.

[46] For one example, see Ambrosino 1939, which cites De Robertis' recent book alongside Waltzing's in several notes.

[47] Monti 1934, x, n. 10, which addresses thanks to 'il mio carissimo F.M. De Robertis.' Acknowledging a debt incurred many decades earlier, De Robertis in turn dedicated his 1998 study of Frederick II to this man, noting, 'In devoto ricordo—ad oltre un cinquantennio dalla scomparsa—di GENNARO MARIA MONTI che mi avviò—giovanissimo assistente—alla riflessione critica sulla vicenda sveva in Italia' [De Robertis 1998, v].

[48] Frangioni 1998.

of Corporativism marked a sharp departure from earlier treatments of the subject, which had emphasized the 'continuity' of the Roman experience into the modern era. Armed with this interpretation, students of the corporative phenomenon in the Roman world could pontificate, to increasingly absurd lengths, on the Fascists' perfection of the model that was only an embryonic notion in ancient societies. Nevertheless, this led to a further permutation, and a fundamental distortion, of De Robertis' vision of the phenomenon in the Roman Empire. Given the active and totalitarian role the Corporative State had taken in economic affairs in Fascist society, Waltzing's bourgeois conception of benevolent encouragement of workers' organizations by a tolerant state could not be safely applied. Instead, scholars of Roman *collegia*, especially in the latter half of the 1930s, insisted that it was only in *Late* Antiquity, when the 'State' attempted to regulate workers' associations, that we can see anything approximating the optimal, i.e. Fascist, conception of labor.

As such, Waltzing was quoted, out of context, and his basic conclusions were twisted to fit the dominant ideology of the period. This transition is reflected, perhaps most starkly, in the works of scholars who wrote in both the early and latter halves of the 1930s—with utterly contradictory conclusions. The culmination of this trend came in 1939, with the work of the very Minister who was most responsible for creating the corporative idea in which Mussolini had taken so much pride, Giuseppe Bottai. In the context of his other activities in this period (as Minister of National Education for the regime), the study of ancient *collegia* was more than a merely antiquarian survey of an obscure subject. It was, instead, at the heart of the Fascist goal of a triumphalist State that would serve as a model for the entire world, either voluntarily or by force.

The predominant scholarly approach to the Roman *collegia* in the early years of the Fascist regime, i.e. until the mid-1930s, is best captured in the works of two young law students, Alfredo Pino-Branca (in his *La Funzione sociale delle Corporazioni nella storia*, published at Padova in 1930) and Francesco G. Lo Bianco (in his *Storia dei collegi artigiani dell'impero*, published at Bologna in 1934). Behind these two figures stood the influential chair of the law faculty at Bologna, Undersecretary of Education for the Fascist regime, and member of the Italian Senate, Pier Silverio Leicht, who was probably the most renowned authority on late Roman and early medieval law in the country, as well as the author of several studies on the corporative

phenomenon. Leicht, in particular, would be attacked by writers on the subject in the late 1930s, and he would also suffer, in the aftermath of the regime's collapse, for his association with it. Lesser-known figures would have to change their conclusions to fit the dominant party line on the subject, and yet their early works reflect the essential themes developed by Waltzing, albeit with layers of adulation for the Fascist government under which they wrote.

'Evolution', in both its biological and its sociological aspects, is the overriding metaphor in Pino-Branca's study, which seems to have been his thesis for the 'Scuola di Scienze Politiche e Sociali' of the University of Padua. Each of the chapters explores the corporative phenomenon in various societies, with titles like 'Gli Egiziani', 'Gli Indiani', 'I Greci', etc. Throughout, the style of argumentation is bizarre and, it appears, strongly influenced by the quasi-Darwinian literature that was common in the era.[49] Drawing on both Herbert Spencer and Rousseau, he claims that associational behavior is to be expected, in any human society, as this seems to be instinctive to the apes, our most primitive ancestors.[50]

In a similar fashion, Pino-Branca claims that it is no accident that all of the societies he has examined boast some sort of corporative or associative phenomenon; the tendency to associate with one's peers is natural, and the differences between the associations are merely the results of societal evolution. Thus, he suggests, 'Granted the possibility of diverse forms, in consequence of the diversity of periods, the analogous function, the unique goal the corporative entity has always pursued, demonstrate the perfect continuity of the corporative entity, as well as their substantial sameness, even though this formal title is lacking.'[51] Any differences between the forms associative behavior takes in various societies are the natural consequence of the rate of progress, and the 'grade of economic evolution' of those societies as a whole. Yet again, the lines of this thought can

[49] For general background, see *inter alia* Hawkins 1997.

[50] Pino-Branca 1930, 10: 'Ma accanto a queste forme di associazioni, che sono istintive ed embrionali, ve ne sono altre più complesse, cioè più o meno strette che costituiscono una famiglia od una società propriamente detta. Un esempio ce lo danno le scimmie, quelle antropomorfe in specie.'

[51] Pino-Branca 1930, 14–15: 'Ammessa la possibilità di forme diverse, in conseguenza della diversità dei tempi, la funzione analoga, lo scopo unico che il fatto corporativo ha sempre perseguito, dimostrano la perfetta continuità del fatto corporativo stesso l'identità sostanziale, se pur manca quella formale.'

be traced back to Gentile's Actualism. Appealing to nature, Gentile had demonstrated that the 'individual' simply did not exist in the animal kingdom. Individuals were always found in organized communities, and these communities were transferred to humans, of every type and in whatever period they were found. Whether in a 'family, horde, clan, tribe, confederation, city-state, nation, or empire,' association in a community has been the only sensible way to corral the collective ambitions of individuals in historical terms.[52]

With these concepts firmly in place, Pino-Branca could devote the bulk of his book (26 of its 97 pages) to a chapter on 'Roma', which essentially recycled Waltzing's *Étude*, in a potted Italian translation (37–63). While the book begins and ends with commentary on the enormous leap forward taken in recent years by the Fascist government, in regulating labor under the aegis of the State,[53] it also attributes this development to much older and well-established trends in economic relations. Whereas Fascist Corporativism appears different from ancient forms of association, 'it is nevertheless a direct consequence of the corporative phenomenon that is attested in every period, when the authority of the State has justifiably intervened in the regulation of those economic relations that ought to secure it life and development.'[54]

Lo Bianco envisioned a similarly unhurried and organic evolution in corporative institutions in his own brief thesis (127 pages) for the University of Bologna a few years subsequently. 'This grandiose organism continued its life calmly,' without becoming entangled with a particular form of government and with only minimal adjustments along its way, toward its ultimate culmination in the present day.[55] This natural evolution, with which Lo Bianco even credits similar

---

[52] Gregor 2005, 113–114.

[53] The Introduction begins with elaborate praise of the second paragraph of the Carta del Lavoro of 1927, and it includes a comment by Mussolini on its importance to his regime (Pino-Branca 1930, 1–3).

[54] Pino-Branca 1930, 97: 'Perciò il corporativismo fascista, pur differenziandosi dalle antiche forme associative, in quanto diversi sono i tempi e gli aspetti che esso à potuto assumere, e diverse le esigenze alle quali à dovuto uniformarsi, è però diretta conseguenza del fenomeno corporativo che si è verificato in ogni tempo, quando l'autorità dello Stato è giustamente intervenuta alla regolamentazione di quei rapporti economici che devono garantirgli la vita e lo sviluppo.'

[55] Lo Bianco 1934, 1: 'Dunque quèsto grandioso organismo continuava sereno la sua vita senza che quanto si svolgeva attorno al trono imperiale ne interrompesse minimamente il cammino.'

developments in the contemporary Soviet Union,[56] yields similar institutions in all societies, but most especially in the Roman Empire. Accordingly, while again plagiarizing whole sections of Waltzing, he could add distinctive touches, such as an extended comparison (24) between the *collegium*'s internal organization and that of the Dopolavoro, the Fascist-directed 'after-work' association.[57] Moreover, he claims that, like the Dopolavoro, the *collegium* served an important social function for its members; while work may have brought them together initially, their bonds of friendship were solidified by meetings and shared expenses.[58]

A most interesting sidelight, in this connection, is De Robertis' review of the *Storia*, which was published in the *Annali del Seminario* at Bari in 1934. In a mildly critical reading, De Robertis observed that Lo Bianco had overlooked some of the essential bibliography on the topic (particularly the works of De Robertis' colleague G.M. Monti) and had made a few key errors of fact. Moreover, he observed the similarity of argument between this book and Pino-Branca's (although the name is misspelled as 'Bino-Branca' here). Nevertheless, treading carefully, with a book that was not merely concerned with antiquity, he summed up his criticism in this manner:[59]

> Questi gli appunti che, forse giudici severi, crediamo di dover muovere al volume del Lo Bianco. Bisogna però riconoscere che, accanto a tali manchevolezze, le quali, d'altro canto, non tolgono al lettore una visione abbastanza precisa della materia, il volume possiede una grande facilità di esposizione, che lo fa leggere volentieri; tanto più che frequenti (se non sempre opportuni) richiami al diritto e alle istituzioni vigenti contribuiscono a dargli un sapore di grande attualità.
>
> We believe it is our duty to lodge these charges, as severe judges perhaps, against Lo Bianco's book. There is also need, however, to recognize that, in spite of such shortcomings, which, in any case, do not deprive the reader of a fairly precise vision of the subject, the book does possess an able facility of expression, so that it is easily read; the more than frequent (though not always appropriate) references

---

[56] The Conclusione refers repeatedly to parallels 'ai sindacati rossi,' 'la NEP nel paese dei Sovieti,' and 'alle fabbriche di stato Sovietiche' (Lo Bianco 1934, 125–127).

[57] On the Dopolavoro, see De Grazia 1981.

[58] Lo Bianco 1934, 127: '. . . sotto un altro aspetto il collegio libero è il Dopolavoro che raduna gli operai e cerca di far godere a loro quello che essi non potrebbero procurarsi con i propri mezzi. . . .'

[59] De Robertis 1934b, 195–196.

> to present-day laws and institutions also contribute to providing a savor of the great events of today.

While these books (as well as that of Alfredo Acíto, to be explored below) have little to recommend them—and were essentially pastiches of Waltzing, with forgettable contemporary commentary overlaid—they reflect the trend of thought of the highly-placed scholar-politician who presided over the law faculty to whom Lo Bianco presented his piece. Born in 1874, Leicht was already a distinguished scholar of legal history when he became chair of the faculty in 1921 and Undersecretary of the Ministry of Public Instruction for the Fascists between July 1928 and September 1929.[60] While he occupied this latter position for just over a year, Leicht continued to operate in conjunction with the regime, entering the Senate in 1934, while also working on the major project of his career, the *Storia del diritto italiano*, published between 1937 and 1942.

Upon his death in 1956, Leicht was accorded a series of obituaries, the most revealing of which is that of C.G. Mor for the *Rivista di Storia del Diritto Italiano*, for which journal Leicht had served as one of the Directors. As one might expect, Leicht experienced a *damnatio memoriae*, of sorts, after the War, being removed from the University and expelled from the Accademia dei Lincei, to which he had belonged since 1920.[61] Nevertheless, at least so Mor maintained, Leicht's basic positions on scholarly issues had withstood the test of time, despite his personal change of fortune. Mor draws particular attention to his analyses of workers' organizations in the Roman world, and especially his 1937 study entitled *Corporazioni romane e arti medievali*.[62] The fundamental positions outlined here can be traced to Leicht's *Lineamenti della introduzione storica al diritto corporativo* (Città di Castello, 1930), which Pino-Branca had cited as his authority on corporative law in *La funzione sociale*. Mor praises Leicht for maintaining sufficient scholarly distance, despite the political currents of the time, calmly investigating Roman workingmen's associations 'senza indulgere o a preconcetti classistici o a preconcetti

---

[60] Cannistraro 1982, 588, Appendix C. Leicht was not unique among his fellow classicists in this type of political service. For examples, see Bandelli 1991, 'Volume IV: L'attualizzazione del testo', 361–397, at 378.

[61] Mor 1956, who characterizes these as 'le amarezze di ingiuste persecuzioni politiche' (15). See also Guiscardo Moschetti's obituary (Moschetti 1956), which alludes merely to his 'studi anche nei momenti difficili.'

[62] Leicht 1937; Leicht 1930.

antimarxisti.'[63] To some extent, Mor was correct in this assessment, as Leicht continued to publish on the topic after the war, and even to cite his own earlier books in the process. In an article published in 1946/1947, Leicht acknowledged the validity of Lo Bianco's approach to a specific issue in his 1934 book, and he referenced his own argumentation on the subject, without commenting on the context in which these books had been written.[64]

Nevertheless, elements of this particular context did appear, especially in the short preface to his *Corporazioni romane*. This begins, predictably, with a comment on the contemporary interest of the subject, given current developments in syndical action in many countries. The importance of workers' unions, forming 'the backbone of the economic life' of their nations, 'has vividly recalled the general attention to the historical precedents of such institutions,' especially in the Roman and medieval periods.[65] While a 'superficial' examination of these precedents would seem to indicate 'profound differences' between past and present, a more careful examination would reveal far more resonances, despite the great distances of time and the differences between their economic structures. Leicht provides two specific examples of this tendency here, both drawn from medieval Italian towns, comparing them with the modern interest in maximizing 'the strict connection of the professional organizations with the State.' This movement was already underway in the Roman Empire, and would be continued 'in good measure, without interruption, right up until the era of the medieval communes [sino all'età comunale]' (11). The study of the medieval corporations in particular is, therefore, not an arcane and remote endeavor. Rather, it can bring to light 'new elements useful for the solution of these very difficult and interesting problems' posed to today's economies.

---

[63] Mor adds, without citing supporting evidence to this effect, '. . . che si può considerare, ancora a vent'anni di distanza, come la parola più conclusiva in proposito' (Mor 1956, 15–16). Moschetti does not mention this book, but he draws attention to Leicht's tendency to stress the 'continuazione delle tradizioni giuridiche' (Moschetti 1956, 194).

[64] Leicht 1946/7, 264, n. 31: 'Il Lo Bianco nella sua Storia dei collegi artigiani dell'impero, Bologna 1934, citò giustamente a prova di un'azione che potremmo chiamare "sindacale" con vocabolo moderno, la Nov. 64 di Giustiniano. Su questo argomento, si veda anche il mio libro Corporazioni romane e arti medievali, Torino 1937, n. 52.'

[65] Leicht 1937, 'Prefazione,' 9–11, at 9.

Once he had tipped his hat to the ideology of the present-day, Leicht could engage the topic in a sound and rational manner. The 'uninterrupted continuity' between the ancient Roman world, medieval Italian societies, and the modern Fascist government seemed to be in line with current thinking on the topic, and this appeared to provide a rationale for studying earlier manifestations of the same cultural phenomenon. However, this line of analysis had already been outstripped by new developments. Leicht himself was challenged on this basis in the 1937 volume of the *Archivio di studi corporativi*, a journal based at Pisa, which was one of the most significant centers of Corporativist thought at the time. In his article on 'Nuovi studi sul problema della continuità storica delle corporazioni,' Filippo Carli launched a vitriolic attack on Leicht, and in remarkably personal terms. Comparing his work unfavorably with that of Monti, De Robertis' colleague and close associate at Bari, Carli suggests that there is no basis, at all, for Leicht's assessment of continuity, beyond his own confidence in his opinion. 'It is,' he writes, 'a simple hypothesis that Leicht presents, a hypothesis however that has only one support: the *affectio scriptoris*, the love of the author for his own thesis. There is not one objective proof; there is only belief.'[66]

The thrust of the argument is revealed in Carli's analogy, 'If it were only a chronological and comparative problem, we would find no difficulty in connecting the corporations instituted by the law of 5 February 1934 with those that existed in 1780.'[67] Carli insisted that the 'genius of Rome' had relied on the model of the *civitas* as an agent of the State and an economic regulator. Accordingly, once the network of cities began to fall apart in Late Antiquity, this model had no hope of surviving intact. It is only through the initiative of a powerful, interventionist State that these economic functions can be absorbed, organized, and transformed.[68] However, even this achieve-

[66] Carli 1937, 333–334: 'È una semplice ipotesi che il Leicht affaccia, una ipotesi però che ha soltanto un fondamento; l'*affectio scriptoris*, l'amore dello scrittore alla propria tesi. Non c'è nessuna prova obbiettiva; c'è solo una credenza.'

[67] Carli 1937, 342: 'Se fosse soltanto un problema cronologico ed analogico, noi non troveremmo difficoltà a collegare le corporazioni istituite dalla legge 5 febbraio 1934 a quelle che esistevano nel 1780.'

[68] Carli 1937, 344–345: 'Il genio di Roma, mercé quella che era stata la sua grande invenzione, la *civitas*, aveva risolto il problema dei rapporti fra Stato ed economia; e a mano a mano che il sistema della *civitas* si dissolse, l'economia si dissociò dalla politica, l'individuo dallo Stato. . . . Così lo Stato, poiché l'individuo gli sfuggiva, lo assorbì, la iniziativa privata divenne una pubblica funzione; e le

ment paled in comparison to the glories of Corporativism, which set a clear line of demarcation with everything that had come before. Given the ideological turn the regime had taken since 1934, then, it was far more prudent to trumpet the *originality* and boldly revolutionary essence of the corporative scheme than to trace it to Roman, or to any other, models.

The vehemence of Carli's rebuke, in a journal of this sort, signals a new movement in the direction of scholarship on the issue. This is also reflected in the 'revisions' that followed in the wake of larger political developments. In 1937, Alfredo Acíto published a new edition of a general survey of 'corporative history' he had originally published in 1924.[69] The dedication of this edition is to Acíto's father and 'to the workers of Italy who, in all periods, revived by the sanctity of the concepts of Family, of Country, of Religion, create the great works of our Latin, Roman, Mediterranean Civilization.' In his preface, Agostino Lanzillo—the authority De Robertis had followed concerning the third way—notes that this present volume is much more than a new edition; it is, rather, 'un'opera *ex novo*,' inspired by the changes of the past decade of Fascist government. Lanzillo adds that, in this book, Acíto has drawn greater attention to the 'tutto embrionale' aspect of Corporazioni in the Middle Ages, and has laid greater stress on how 'new' the Fascist solution to the problems of labor actually is. Acíto himself comments at length on the 'spiritual' aspect of what Mussolini and 'our Latin race' is attempting to achieve in the modern world.[70] In his estimation—and in this, of course, Acíto was no exception—the critical turning point in recent times was Italy's acquisition of an Empire, as declared in May 1936. Reflecting the general mood of the regime and its propagandistic goals in this arena, Acíto observes, 'One more time the Latin Mediterranean civilization reassumes the title of directress of empire, reconfirming that, as Rome was truly the *fatherland of the State*, in Antiquity, today

associazioni professionali, da libere organizzazioni che erano, divennero organismi statali-burocratici.'

[69] Acíto 1937. The original version of this study was Acíto 1924.

[70] For examples of this perspective, see Acíto 1937, 11 ('Anche la *Istituzione della Corporazione*, esprime il suo prevalente carattere *sociale*, ma, *da noi*, la Corporazione è una *creazione dello spirito*, che non è sfuggita al metodo *costruttivo* del genio della stirpe'), 54 ('come la nostra razza latina' and 'un suo carattere istintivo') and 56 ('. . . sono l'espressione dello spirito della nostra Civiltà Mediterranea Romana, senza dei quali non potevano nascere e rinascere, dopo tanti secoli, le stesse istituzioni.')

it has expressed with the genius of Mussolini, the political [and] social doctrine that has overcome and annulled every preceding political doctrine, creating the *fascist civilization*.'[71] In blunt (and not terribly sophisticated) terms, Acito thus demonstrated the superiority of developments since the revivification of Italy's imperial ambitions: the Romans had achieved a great deal, *but* the development of corporative institutions was only a shadow of what has been achieved today. In short, as Mussolini was fond of observing, 'Le glorie del passato siano superate dalle glorie dell'avvenire!'

Lo Bianco himself, as will be explored in the following chapter, modified his position on the subject to fit the new agenda, and became, at least so it appears, the 'official' expositor of Roman *collegia* for the regime. However, other scholars continued to publish on the topic, albeit adhering to this new point of view. In 1937, Vincenzo Bandini published a collection of *Appunti sulle Corporazioni romane*, announcing '[l]a modestia dei miei intenti' in so doing.[72] Unwilling to attempt to rewrite or reinvestigate the claims of earlier studies, Bandini set the more modest goal of advancing 'points' on 'the evolution of the Roman Corporazioni,' which he hoped would give the reader a sense of their importance in Roman life and, perhaps, their relevance 'for our modern epoch,' as well.[73] While he conceded that the government had traditionally favored a posture of non-intervention in workers' freedoms, the needs of 'public utility' ultimately forced the State to intervene in their operations. With the crises of the 3rd century CE, the State, with an eye to the good of all its citizens, was forced to accentuate its powers, and to reorganize its various entities in the public interest.[74]

---

[71] Acíto 1937, 472: 'Ancora una volta la civiltà latina mediterranea riassume la formula direttrice d'imperio, riconfermando che, come Roma fu veramente *la patria dello Stato*, nell'Antichità, oggi ha espresso col genio di Mussolini, la dottrina politica sociale che ha superato e annullato ogni precedente dottrina politica, creando la *civiltà fascista*.'

[72] Bandini 1937, vii.

[73] Bandini 1937, vii: 'In questi "appunti" mi propongo di presentare un quadro della formazione e dell'evoluzione delle corporazioni romane e soprattutto di dare al lettore un'idea dei problemi che presenta questo campo di studio di somma importanza per la conoscenza della vita sociale giuridica e politica di Roma, e che può forse costituire una preziosa esperienza anche per la nostra epoca moderna.'

[74] Bandini 1937, ix: 'La loro utilità pubblica consisteva nella conservazione di un'attività necessaria alla vita dello Stato. I membri dei collegi potevano essere artigiani o meno. Lo Stato si limitava a comprovare l'utilità della professione e la necessità che questa conservasse le proprie tradizioni. . . . È al terzo secolo che, dato

While Bandini did not add anything new to the store of knowledge concerning *collegia*, perhaps the most interesting item related to his book is the review it received in *The Journal of Roman Studies* in 1939. The reviewer, apparently Harold Mattingly, points out the numerous typographical errors, mistakes in the Latin, and lack of attention to the relationships between associative behavior and Christian communities. Amazingly, though, he claims that these failings do not detract from the importance of Bandini's subject. In fact, he states, 'The relation of the corporation to the State has not lost its interest to-day, and we are grateful to the citizen of modern Italy, in which corporations play so important a role, for taking us back to comparable problems of Italy in much earlier stages.'[75] Like Duff, in his commentary on De Robertis' *Il diritto di associativo romano*, this reviewer was not unaware of the contemporary significance of the *collegia* for modern Italians. However, he did not therefore assume that 'propaganda' was the motive of the work—Corporativism was merely the backdrop against which a modern Italian might make 'interesting' comments on the past.

Over time, naturally, it would become impossible to ignore the implications of comparing Roman *collegia* with their modern counterparts. This was obviously the case with Alberto Paolo Torri's work published in 1940 and revised in 1941, entitled *Le Corporazioni romane, cenno storico giuridico economico, con prefazione di Mariano Pierro*.[76] Here, Torri dismisses the applicability of the Roman model, in any real sense, to the triumphant Corporative State of his own day. In fact, his 'Premessa' attributes the corporations to 'the political genius and the innovative, energetic, and infallible will of the Duce,' and quotes Mussolini's confidence that a State composed of them will be empowered to reorganize a disordered economic system.[77] This State is only possible, he argues, with Mussolini and the entirely new order he

---

il nuovo ordinamento pubblicistico ed amministrativo, nel quale lo Stato si presenta come accentratore esclusivo di tutti i poteri, non si può più concepire che un ente possa adempiere attività pubblicistiche e servire all'interesse sociale senza essere necessariamente un organo dello Stato e rientrare tra gli enti di diritto pubblico.'

75 Mattingly 1939, 275–276.

76 Torri 1941. This second edition is described as being 'riveduta ed ampliata.'

77 Torri 1941, 7: 'Le corporazioni, che il genio politico e la volontà innovatrice, animatrice ed infallibile del Duce hanno creato per far "rientrare nello Stato anche il mondo, sin qui estraneo e disordinato, dell'economia", ci riportano col pensiero ai secoli passati durante i quali esse segnarono pagine gloriose nella storia della nostra patria.'

has fashioned in recent decades. Adding a series of photographs to his 'Conclusione,' of the Blackshirts marching and of the creation of the Carta del Lavoro, Torri insists that Fascism has dislodged any system that came before, or could come along after. For examples, he points out, 'Corporative organization in Republican Rome and in the first period of the Empire was inadequate to discipline the complex socio-economic material of the immense organism; in the period of the Late Empire the State annulled the individual and transformed him into a passive instrument of its bureaucracy; in the Medieval period the corporative system was adequate for a local economy and was therefore limited and selfish in its work.' Fascism has cast all of this aside, making a bold statement for the importance of labor and the organic nature of industry. The Carta del Lavoro has, in fact, 'consigned [them] to history, like the Law of the Twelve Tables of the most ancient Roman law. . . .'[78]

Like others of the period, Torri ties the innovativeness of the corporative system to the Carta del Lavoro's insistence on the spiritual and moral value of work, as a 'social duty' in its own right. It is thus to be distinguished sharply from both the 'liberalism' that grew out of the French Revolution, promoting the emancipation of the individual, and the 'socialism' that is based on the notion of class struggle, thus negating the power and influence of an interventionist State in economic affairs (279–280). The Fascist 'corporative idea', by contrast, emanating from the work of the Duce, is a product of the Italian national character, which considers work a 'mission', rather than a mere factor of production.[79]

One might argue, with some justification, that the works of these marginal scholars should not be considered relevant to the study of historiographic shifts regarding a complex subject in ancient Roman

---

[78] Torri 1941, 282–283: 'L'organizzazione corporativa di Roma repubblicana e del primo periodo dell'Impero fu inadeguata a disciplinare la complessa materia economico-sociale dell'immenso organismo; nel periodo del Basso Impero lo Stato annullò l'individuo e lo trasformò in uno strumento passivo della sua burocrazia; nel periodo Medievale il sistema corporativo fu adeguato alla economia locale ed ebbe quindi còmpiti limitati ed egoistici . . . consegnata alla storia come la Legge delle XII Tavole dell'antichissimo diritto romano. . . .'

[79] Torri 1941, 280: 'L'idea corporativa è sorta nel clima della Rivoluzione per opera del suo Capo ed è essenzialmente italiana e fascista e l'economia fascista non è soltanto una economia controllata, ma una economia organizzata per un alto fine di carattere nazionale. . . . Il lavoro è una missione, prima che una fatica ed è un fattore di vita sociale. . . .'

legal and social history. However, one might also argue that it is the mediocre scholar, far more often than the towering genius, who better reflects trends in the wider world. For the most part, these were young men entering upon their scholarly careers in a chaotic and fast-moving period in the history of Italy, and of Europe in general, and it is only natural that they attempted to solidify their positions by towing the party line, or else what they took to be the party line of the moment.[80] Nevertheless, these poorer scholars were not alone in looking to the past with eyes shaped by present realities. Among the commentators on the Roman *collegia* was also Aristide Calderini, of the Catholic University of Milan, who was one of the dominant figures in Roman epigraphic and regional studies until his death in 1968.[81]

In a brief piece of 21 pages, which apparently began as a lecture, Calderini commented on 'Le associazioni professionali in Roma antica.' The date of the text is unclear, although it was apparently delivered in the 1930s, as a 'Conferenza detta all'Associazione per lo sviluppo dell'alta cultura' in Milano. Addressing a non-academic audience, the speech touches briefly on the major stages of collegial development, and Calderini compares his account with 'the composition of a natural landscape while moving rapidly across the scene in a too-swift automobile.' Despite their superficial similarities with their Roman counterparts, today's Corporazioni are predicated upon ideas that were simply unavailable, and even impossible to conceive, in the Roman context. While they were in embryo in the Roman Empire, there was lacking:[82]

---

[80] Some of the scholars continued their careers after the War, though, understandably, on different subjects. Torri, for example, shifted his attention to 19th-century matters, in Torri 1956.

[81] When Calderini died, the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan honored his service to the University with a commemorative plaque, still displayed in the central courtyard. The Latin inscription celebrates his achievement with, among other phrases, 'Vir domi forisque multigena doctrina clarus Tarenti natus integram vitam Mediolani transegit, ubi de antiquitatum monumentis sedulo inquisivit multaque de iis peracute scripsit plurima opere et consilio patravit.'

[82] Calderini n.d., 21: '. . . un nuovo fattore che non esisteva e non poteva esistere nel tentativo di Roma imperiale, la coscienza cioè e la volontà dell'interesse superiore, chiaramente riconosciuto e dichiarato, non dell'interesse di un individuo, e fosse pure l'imperatore, ma della nazione, di un potere cioè che è dell'ordine di quelli che affermano l'altruismo contro l'egoismo brutale, sia egoismo di individui o egoismo di categoria, di un potere, la nazione, che è forza, vita, speranza di tanto nostro sacrificio e di tanta nostra passione.'

> . . . a new factor that did not exist and could not exist in the (unsuccessful) attempt of imperial Rome, that is the consciousness and the will of a superior interest, clearly recognized and delineated, not of the interest of an individual, even if it were the emperor, but of the nation, that is of a power that is along the lines of those that affirm altruism against brute egotism, whether it were egotism of individuals or egotism of a category (of individuals), of a power, the nation, that is force, life, hope of all our sacrifice and all our passion.

In other words, we are not far removed from the sentiments De Robertis expressed in his article in 1934. Only a strong leader and a properly constituted 'State' can replace the selfish interests of a class or an individual with the totality of interests that will benefit all. After all, the body cannot function with each of its parts demanding an equal share, as one might compare—and contemporaries would surely have compared—St. Paul's Biblical metaphor (and/or Menenius Agrippa's, during the Secession of the Plebs) of the body and its members. Because the Romans were too 'materialistic' and lacked a properly 'spiritual' understanding of labor—and because they did not live under a modern State, one that superseded individuals—truly corporative action was impossible in their economic organization.

It is, therefore, all the more surprising that not a trace of this sentiment can be found in De Robertis' first major book on the 'fenomeno corporativo', published in the midst of all these other works, in 1938. The frontispiece of the book clearly announces its provenance, and reminds readers of the ideological context in which it was produced: 'Collana di studi a cura della Scuola di Perfezionamento in Studi Corporativi della R. Università di Bari.' This is followed by an exhaustive table of contents, arranged in 130 detailed sections, and then a Preface that is—as always with De Robertis—both rigorous in analysis and rich in metaphor. A line from Goethe's *Faust* is quoted, in the original, to the charming effect that, 'Das Was bedenke, mehr bedenke Wie' (line 6992), and the two pages follow upon the theme announced in this line. The author makes it clear that this is a complex subject, and one that can only be properly understood by placing it in its wider socio-political context.[83] This

[83] De Robertis 1938, xvi: 'Ma l'argomento più arduo di questo studio (ove non si fosse voluto fare opera di arida erudizione) si era la valutazione giuridico-sociale delle singole norme nei loro adattamenti pratici, dacchè eminente nel campo del diritto associativo, più che in altre branche del diritto pubblico, si rivela l'aderenza

is, of course, very difficult to reconstitute, given the paltry and fragmentary nature of our sources, but one must also be aware of the evolution of the system, and of the fundamental changes that occurred over the course of Roman history. 'But the most difficult task of this study,' he argues, 'would be (if one has no desire to make it a work of arid erudition) the legal-social appraisal of the individual regulations in their practical adaptations, since the adherence to the political phenomenon reveals itself clearly in the field of associative law, more than in other branches of public law.' In other words, he continues, it is not possible to weigh the impact of the associative phenomenon without considering the changes of government, and 'the fluctuations and accommodations' that followed upon these, throughout antiquity.

The themes of adaptability, change over time, and flexibility in the face of change echo throughout the book as a whole, and he sounds this theme in the introductory pages, together with the sense of homage that he feels necessary to producing yet another book on this subject. 'We feel confident,' he writes, in offering this study that elaborates the doctrine of Roman corporations, 'on which the weakening hand of Theodor Mommsen let fall his quill.' In this respect, De Robertis may have had in mind the larger passage of *Faust* to which he had alluded at the opening of his preface. Here, Homunculus dismisses Wagner's contemplative life in academic study, saying, 'Scrutinize your ancient manuscripts, collect life's elements as they direct, and then put the parts together cautiously. Think about the What, and even more, the Why.'[84]

Upon taking up Mommsen's pen, De Robertis deliberately followed along the lines set by the 'classica tesi del Mommsen e del Waltzing' (31), for virtually the entirety of his nearly 500 pages. However, he also focuses new attention on the period of Late Antiquity, in which the State began to encroach on the traditional freedoms

---

al fenomeno politico . . . quindi la necessità, specie nell'età della repubblica e del basso impero, di proiettarle costantemente sullo sfondo politico-sociale contingente, seguendone le fluttazioni e gli accomodamenti. Confidiamo per tal modo di avere offerto agli studiosi un quadro completo del diritto associativo, dando opera alla elaborazione di quella dottrina delle corporazioni romane, su cui la mano stanca di Teodoro Mommsen lasciò cadere la penna.'

[84] *Faust*, Zweiter Teil, ll. 6989–6992: 'Entfalte du die alten Pergamente, Nach Vorschrift sammle Lebenselemente Und füge sie mit Vorsicht eins ans and're. Das Was bedenke, mehr bedenke Wie.'

enjoyed by workers in earlier periods. Waltzing had described the gradual enslavement of workers for his own, turn-of-the-century Christian Democratic purposes, but De Robertis adds a more vivid, more rhetorical series of images to the process for reasons of his own. At the conclusion of his third chapter, and by way of introducing the fourth—entitled, 'Lo Stato e i Collegi professionali nei secoli IV e V'—he sketches the scenario that befell the *collegia* once the 'state', such as it was, had intervened in collective organizations.

While he cautions that one should not overstate the case on either side of the balance, it is clear that something profound did take place in Late Antiquity, and that this led to a significant loss of freedom and independence for workers' associations. What had been a generally pleasant and cooperative arrangement between government and *collegia* gave way to that of the professional *corpus*, which became 'stiffened and crystallized in the bureaucratic gearshifts of the state.' Upon this arteriosclerosis in Rome's circulatory system followed the disengagement of the associations from providing 'molti servizi pubblici,' and these were left to the 'egemonia dei grandi capitalisti,' who were free to provide them, or not, at their own whim.[85] It is remarkable that, in his prison diaries, Antonio Gramsci had recently described the 'hegemony' of the ruling classes, in both economic and cultural terms, though his writings were not widely circulated in Italy until after the fall of the Fascists.[86]

Nonetheless, it is the image of the ossified, bureaucratic, stultifying intervention by a quasi-totalitarian state that lingers with one upon reading the remainder of the book. Given the date and circumstances under which it was written, this may have been a bold and daring argument—and it was certainly out-of-keeping with the

[85] De Robertis 1938, 442: 'Per quel che riguarda tuttavia la valutazione in ordine ai risultati dell'azione stato-corporazione nella Roma imperiale, a nostro avviso, si eccede in una severità non completamente giustificata, dacchè si trascura il momento più felice iniziale per far pesare la severità del giudizio su quello finale del basso impero, in cui la corporazione professionale, irrigidita e cristallizzata nell'ingranaggio burocratico dello stato, aveva perduto completamente le caratteristiche che l'avevano contraddistinta nei primi tre secoli dell'impero, in cui, stringendosi allo stato in un legame operativo e continuato e provvedendo al disimpegno di molti servizi pubblici, affrancò quest'ultimo dalla egemonia dei grandi capitalisti, conferendogli una libertà di movimento ed una indipendenza (rispetto al mondo dell'alta finanza), che invano si era cercata nel periodo repubblicano.'

[86] Ironically, though, a portion of Gramsci's detention (1928–1933) was in Turi, in the vicinity of Bari.

flow of debate on the subject in the mid-to-late 1930s. De Robertis here develops the dichotomy of freedom of association versus rigid, bureaucratic state intervention, at precisely the moment that the regime was most interested in seizing the levers of industrial production in the country. However, it might be argued that he had provided himself cover in the 1934 article, by stressing the utter *originality* of Fascist Corporativism, and the inappropriateness of drawing explicit comparisons between it and the distant Roman past. In this case, it would appear that, in 1938, he added further corroboration of the incompatibility of the past and the present by cleverly drawing on the racial imagery that was also current at the moment.

The fourth chapter ends with another extended comment on the disastrous change of course brought on in the Late Empire when the Emperors intervened in economic affairs. Nonetheless, at this point, De Robertis adds a new concept, i.e. that the bureaucratic stiffening of institutions and thwarting of traditional freedoms was a *foreign* import, one that quashed 'the practical spirit of the Latin race.' With 'the grand crises of Italic civilization in the third century AD' came 'the end of the Roman professional association, in its genuine expression of an entity provided with its own legal and social autonomy.' The new attitudes were 'Hellenic' and 'Byzantine' imports that led to the 'bureaucratic tendency of the state,' as well as to transformed organs of state administration.[87] The 'absolute rigidity' of the Byzantine monarchs replaced 'all the characteristics of adaptation and of supreme elasticity' that had been impressed upon 'lo spirito pratico della stirpe latina.'[88] Again, one is struck by the risk that De Robertis may have been taking in expressing such thoughts about the 'Roman' and 'Latin' race, and its ingrained quality of flexibility

---

[87] De Robertis 1938, 458: 'La grande crisi della civiltà italica del III secolo d. C. segna la fine dell'associazione professionale romana, nella sua espressione genuina di ente fornito di propria autonomia giuridica e sociale. Le nuove concezioni statuali improntate ai canoni del risorto ellenismo e che ebbero a farsi strada trionfanti nell'ambiente bizantino, portando alla accentuazione, anzi alla esasperazione, della tendenza burocratica dello stato, alterarono anche la natura dai rapporti tra stato e corporazioni, trasformando queste ultime quasi in organi dell'amministrazione statuale.'

[88] De Robertis 1938, 459: 'Nel VI secolo la stratificazione sociale è completa: la struttura amministrativa dell'impero, anche nei riguardi delle associazioni professionali, ha raggiunto quei limiti di accentramento e di rigidità assoluta che erano sempre stati nei voti dei monarchi ellenistici; ma aveva nel contempo perdute tutte le caratteristiche di adattamento e di elasticità somma che ad essa aveva impresso lo spirito pratico della stirpe latina.'

in the course of events.[89] Is he suggesting that any attempt to enhance State power is mere aping of a despotic, oriental tendency to bureaucratic control? If so, how then should we interpret Mussolini's observation that 'there can be no regulation without control'?

Thus, while lesser figures were applauding the desirability of State intervention in the economy for the good of all its citizens, the first scholarly works of Francesco Maria De Robertis explored the more negative aspects of this process, all from the 'safe' distance of ancient Rome. As Minio-Paluello astutely observed, some Fascist-era professors could preserve the outward appearance of loyalty that was essential to their employment, while also, within certain limits, pursuing their true academic interests. In fact, he claimed, 'The great majority of professors . . . had a passive attitude to public life, and made it clear privately that they accepted the political situation only to be able to carry on their work.'[90] De Robertis' early works may be a case in point in support of this assertion. By stressing the uniqueness of the Fascist experiment, he managed to maintain an objective stance regarding the available evidence, making a permanent contribution to scholarship in an institution that—for a brief time—bore the name of a dictator.

---

[89] See below, Chapter 5, for further intersections of race and the 'Roman' theme.
[90] Minio-Paluello 1946, 165.

CHAPTER FOUR

COLLEGIA, THE INSTITUTE OF ROMAN STUDIES, AND 'ROMANITÀ'

When he died in September 1972, Carlo Galassi Paluzzi, the founder and director of the Istituto di Studi Romani (ISR) from 1925 to 1944, was accorded two obituaries in the Institute's journal, *Studi Romani*.[1] In both of the commemorations, Pietro Romanelli and Ottorino Morra charted the career of the Institute's guiding spirit, but they proceeded with caution, as one might expect, in describing the ISR's activities, as well as Galassi Paluzzi's connections with government officials, during the Fascist years. Nevertheless, there are similar and revealing phrases in the two pieces, which can be read as commentary on the Director's attitude toward the regime. According to Romanelli, Galassi Paluzzi was born in Naples in 1893, but 'to a family of Roman origin,' and, as a result of his background and early education, he had possessed a 'cultural and spiritual' affinity for ancient Rome. His studies fostered 'a love, wholly passionate and enlightened, for Rome,' driven by his recognition of what 'Rome has represented, and represents still, in the history and in the civil and spiritual development of humanity.'[2] Morra echoes this sentiment, stressing the universal, and not merely the Fascist, appeal of 'Romanness,' stressing, 'He [Galassi Paluzzi] saw the Romanità as the element of humanity that puts itself at the service of the evangelical message for its actualization in the world.'[3]

---

[1] Romanelli 1972; Morra 1972. Technically, these pieces appeared in the second series of the Institute of Roman Studies' official journal, when it was re-established in 1952. The Institute's first journal was entitled *Roma*, and its issues, especially those created throughout the 1930s, are explored below.

[2] Romanelli 1972, 465: 'Poteva dirsi figlio di Roma, anche se nato a Napoli, perché di famiglia originaria romana e a Roma formatosi culturalmente e spiritualmente. E fu questa formazione culturale e spirituale che, dopo un periodo di travagliata inquietudine interiore, gli fece concepire un amore, appassionato insieme ed illuminato, per Roma, dettato e animato soprattutto dalla coscienza di quel che Roma ha rappresentato, e rappresenta tuttora, nella storia e nello sviluppo civile e spirituale dell'umanità.'

[3] Morra 1972, 474: 'Egli vedeva la romanità come l'elemento di umanità che si pone al servizio del messaggio evangelico per la sua attuazione nel mondo.'

However, such universal applications were not in evidence in a report Galassi Paluzzi had delivered to the Institute some four decades previously, on 29 October 1932. In this statement, as published in the Institute's journal *Roma*, he requested, 'Permit me to convey the common sentiment, by proposing that, on the occasion of the Decennale [the tenth anniversary of the Fascist takeover of the government], the Institute of Roman Studies express its devoted homage and profound acknowledgement to the Duce for this new Italy, that, based on Rome and the name of Rome, is speaking to the World the new, the expected, the necessary speech of human civilization.'[4] By this construction, therefore, 'humanity' would only profit from Romanness when the reborn, Fascist Italy shared its own concept with the outside world. And if this happens, one would expect the Duce (and, perhaps, the Institute itself?) to share some of the credit for spreading this 'good news' with those not fortunate enough to have been touched directly by the Roman experience.

Accordingly, no survey of the development of *collegia* scholarship in the Fascist years would be complete without a close analysis of the institutional, ideological, and governmental structures that made this resurgence of interest possible. Nor would it be satisfactory to ignore the larger implications of the topic for the general Fascist program of 'romanità', the 'Romanness' to which the regime, and thus all true Italians, aspired in the modern world. Oddly, though, it is only in very recent years that attention has been paid to the roles of scholarly and semi-scholarly institutions in the development of the classics in Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany. Beat Näf has drawn attention to this fact, in introducing a collection of papers presented at Zürich in 1998, all of which addressed the theme of classical studies under these regimes. Whereas most approaches to the subject have concerned individual scholars or specific institutions, Näf suggests that it is preferable to analyze entire disciplines, across academic institutions, as well as the scholarly apparatus that underwrote and supported their individual pursuits.[5] As many of these scholarly organizations were under more or less direct governmen-

[4] Galassi Paluzzi 1932b, 339: 'Mi permetto d'interpretare il comune sentimento, proponendo che, in occasione del Decennale, l'Istituto di Studi Romani esprima l'omaggio suo devoto e la profonda riconoscenza al Duce di questa nuova Italia che da Roma e nel nome di Roma sta dicendo al Mondo la nuova, l'attesa, la necessaria parola di umana civiltà.'

[5] Näf 2001b. [See also my review in Perry 2003.]

tal control throughout the era, it is important to understand how official pronouncements and ideological prerogatives found their way into academic work—and workers—living under these regimes.[6] On the other hand, it is also understandable that the specific activities of these institutions—most of which were either reestablished in the wake of the regimes' collapse or, even more often, passed into the postwar world without substantial alteration—have not been analyzed in detail since 1945. As Volker Losemann has demonstrated, in both an influential monograph and in his piece for the Näf collection, it is only, perhaps, in very recent years that one can approach these sensitive matters without simply excusing or excoriating the behavior one encounters in the past.[7] Losemann has also pointed out that, at least in the case of the German universities, some material has only become available since the fall of the DDR, and the general re-examination of the previous decades that has followed upon this event.

Nevertheless, the activities of the ISR, an institute (at least in its earliest permutation) virtually coterminous with the Fascist regime, are remarkably well documented, in the full text of its official journal, *Roma: Rivista di Studi e di Vita Romana*,[8] and in the published 'Atti' of its five 'National Congresses', held over the course of the 1920s and 1930s. If anything, as Luciano Canfora pointed out nearly thirty years ago, these materials are crucial evidence, not only for the development of classical disciplines in the Fascist years or for the evolution of the Institute itself, but also for the connections between Fascist officials and intellectuals in the regime, generally. As he observed, these journals attest to 'the zeal with which the greatest exponents of Fascist politics participated in the "academic years" of the Institute of Roman Studies,' and they give voice to the 'clearly political' goals

[6] Most of the 21 papers in the collection (four in Italian, one in English, and the remainder in German) address these points, but the most revealing in the set, along these lines, is Stefan Rebenich's careful study of both the short-term and the ongoing projects of the Academy in Berlin, entitled 'Zwischen Anpassung und Widerstand? Die Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften von 1933 bis 1945' [Rebenich 2001].

[7] Losemann 1977; Losemann 2001. A similar attempt along these lines, though for primary and secondary education in Fascist Italy, may be found in Charnitzky 1994.

[8] The cover of each number of the journal indicated that it was the 'Organo Ufficiale dell'Istituto di Studi Romani.'

that 'the "specialists" amplified and echoed in communications, in courses, in conferences.'[9]

The 'zeal' and the 'goals' of the Institute clearly sprang from the prerogatives and predilections of its Director. The first page of the first issue of *Roma* declares the intent and the direction of this new publishing venture: 'By placing at the head of this review simply the name of Rome in its solemn brevity, we have wished to signify that we propose here to illustrate our city, as far as our small abilities will allow, in all of the manifestations of its life, in its history, in its memories and in its modern interests.'[10] The focus of the journal would thus be the story of the city of Rome, through various points in its 'eternal' existence, but it was also clear that these historical surveys would have a 'spiritual' dimension, as well. 'Romanness' was filtered, in Galassi Paluzzi's imagination, through the lens of his own scholarship on the Counter-Reformation, when 'Rome' had come under attack from outside forces. As early as 1927, Galassi Paluzzi would declare that 'Roma' could be juxtaposed with 'Antiroma' as absolutely incompatible forces, historically, aesthetically, and spiritually. With disturbing implications for the future, he identified 'Protestantesimo' as the ultimate progenitor of Communism, and declared, 'Let us repeat it again: the enemies of and the perils for romanità are truly two: Germanic criticism and Jews.'[11]

It is, of course, important to place Galassi Paluzzi within the context of his era, and to evaluate his pronouncements on these themes against the backdrop of others who agreed with his general point of view. In a recent history of the ISR, Paolo Brezzi, while acknowledging that the basic elements of the Institute were 'indissolubly linked' to the personality of its founder,[12] Galassi Paluzzi himself was a representative of a certain type of scholar in this place and time. There were many other exponents of this particular perspective, one

[9] Canfora 1977, reprinted in Canfora 1989.

[10] Galassi Paluzzi 1923, 1: 'Col porre in testa a questa rivista semplicemente il nome di Roma nella sua solenne brevità abbiamo voluto significare che ci proponiamo di illustrare la nostra città, per quanto lo comporta la modestia delle nostre forze, in tutte le manifestazioni della sua vita, nella sua storia, nelle sue memorie e nei suoi interessi moderni.'

[11] Galassi Paluzzi 1927, 441 and 444: 'Ripetiamolo ancora: i nemici e i pericoli per la romanità sono veramente due: criticismo germanico ed ebrei.'

[12] Brezzi 1992, 707. (The previous page contains a picture of Galassi Paluzzi, together with the American Lily Ross Taylor, as part of the Horace bimillenary celebration in 1935.)

that was widely diffuse in Italy between 1929 (the date of the Lateran Accords between Mussolini and the Church) and 1942, and could be roughly defined as 'clericale-nazionale.' Nevertheless, Brezzi adds, the Institute brought particular emphasis to the concept of 'Rome', albeit a Rome that was rhetorically constructed and 'historically deformed by political exigencies.'[13]

This emphasis was not merely inspired by its Direttore, however. Morra himself rose from Segretario to Segretario Generale of the Institute in 1938 and would, upon the refoundation (and rechristening) of 'L'Istituto Nazionale di Studi Romani' in 1952, become its Direttore, a post he held until 1974.[14] In 1938, Morra contributed a brief survey of the history and activities of the ISR to a publication entitled *Accademie e istituti di cultura: Cenni storici*,[15] and he described the mission of the Institute on his first page. According to this account, the Institute was founded both to promote 'in the historical climate created by Fascism, a rebirth of the Latin mentality in Italy and abroad,' but also to draw attention to 'the immense and fundamental contribution that Latin civilization has bestowed upon the people of the world.'[16] Morra was especially careful to underscore the international implications of the revival of 'Romanness' in the modern world. Rome, for centuries, has been 'the center and guide of Civilization,' and its present-day legatees have a significant role to play in leading the world away from 'Antiroman' forces. In fact, the Institute is aiming 'to create a reflowering over the ruins of the antiroman world that is destroying itself in the immense disaster caused by itself, the great Western civilization that cannot survive without having Rome as its center and as its guide.'[17] One presumes that he was referring

---

[13] Brezzi 1992, 707: 'Il Galassi può essere assunto—in positivo e in negativo—a tipico esponente di un certo tipo di cultura assai diffusa in Italia tra il 1929 e il '42, che potrebbe essere definita come "clericale-nazionale", aggiungendovi però subito un'accentuazione "romana" molto pronunciata e che è facilmente comprensibile, dato che egli agiva in una Roma retoricamente assai esaltata e, forse, storicamente deformata per esigenze politiche.'

[14] Further, see Brezzi 1992, 709.

[15] Morra 1938. The volume was dedicated to Bottai, the Minister of National Education, by Edoardo Scardamaglia, 'Il Direttore Generale' delle accademie e delle biblioteche to the Ministero dell'educazione nazionale (5–8).

[16] Morra 1938, 617: '. . . collo scopo di promuovere, nel clima storico creato dal Fascismo, una rinascita della mentalità latina in Italia e all'Estero, e di contribuirvi facendo conoscere e valorizzando, con severo metodo scientifico, l'immenso e fondamentale contributo che la civiltà latina ha largito al mondo civile.'

[17] Morra 1938, 617: '. . . a far rifiorire su le rovine del mondo antiromano che

to the Great War, and the 'antiroman' forces that, in his estimation, had left Europe in ruins. Only by paying heed, once again, to the civilizing tendencies of Rome, now resident in the modern Italian, can Western civilization hope to revive itself. Such ideas had obvious contemporary significance. Analyzing the various journals that created some of the cultural supports of the Fascist regime, Albertina Vittoria has noted that, of the 120 institutes and academies functioning in Italy in 1938, only 14 had been created by the Fascist government itself. However, Fascism had indirectly given life to a number of organizations that were pressed into service in the work of 'political propaganda.'[18] Her first example along these lines is the Institute of Roman Studies.

Accordingly, while each volume of *Roma* addressed the life of the city, at various points in time, each also concentrated heavily on moments that reflected the highest spiritual development of the Roman ideal. A typical issue would feature several articles—usually with copious illustration—describing picturesque or evocative portions of the city, or specific incidents in its past. These would be followed by a series of notes (particularly a perennial feature entitled 'Roma Ignorata,' tracing the building of various churches and other structures during the Baroque period), and then a lengthy series of book reviews.[19]

Surprisingly, however, the first detailed analysis of the contents of *Roma* (though even this does not include the 'Atti' proceedings) seems to have been Antonio La Penna's study, presented at the Zürich conference and published under the title, 'La rivista *Roma* e l'Istituto di Studi Romani: Sul culto della romanità nel periodo fascista.'[20] His analysis was also published, in an amplified and more detailed format, in 1999, for the journal *Italia contemporanea*.[21] In both pieces, La Penna offers a careful reading of the volumes of the journal, particularly in the 1930s and 1940s, and he comments briefly on their

si va spegnendo nell'immane disastro da esso causato, la grande civiltà occidentale che non può vivere senza avere Roma come centro e come guida.'

[18] Vittoria 1983, 66.

[19] The pattern can be seen as early as the third volume, published in 1925, one of whose issues contains five articles ('Lungo la via Ostiense,' 'La famiglia di Vanozza Catanei,' 'Roma Papale nei sonetti di Gioacchino Belli,' 'Così finirono i "Barberi",' and 'Marmi antichi'), a series of short notes, and a set of book reviews.

[20] La Penna 2001.

[21] La Penna 1999.

scholarly weight, as well as their ideological content. His general conclusion is that the journal, by stressing the 'continuity' of ancient, Christian, and present-day Rome, attempted to reinforce the Catholic aspects and the otherwise 'tendenze più conservatrici del fascismo.'[22] In fact, he argues, these themes became more pronounced in the final years of the regime (and of the journal), when it is clear that 'l'espressione di devozione e fedeltà al re viene ribadita da Galassi Paluzzi' and 'la valorizzazione dell'eredità cristiana venne rafforzandosi, io credo, nella rivista.'[23]

While La Penna is certainly correct in his assertion that the journal 'furnishes an excellent documentation for the ideological interpretation of ancient Rome on the part of Fascist culture,'[24] his survey does not deal with the other activities of the Institute in these decades, nor does it draw attention to the ISR's contacts with influential party functionaries and its own appearances in state functions. He does, however, throw important light on the connections the Institute forged with Pius XI, Pius XII, and other Church officials, as all of these forces operated under and interacted with the Fascist regime. For one example, he points to a remarkable photograph of Pius XII, issuing his benediction upon Galassi Paluzzi and the Institute, one that was, apparently, signed in his own hand on 20 April 1939 and printed in the 1939 volume of *Roma*. The text reads:[25]

> Al diletto figlio il Prof. Carlo Galassi Paluzzi impartiamo di cuore l'Apostolica Benedizione, formando l'augurio che l'Istituto di Studi Romani, da lui presientuto con amore pari alla nobiltà degli intenti, sia sempre efficace richiamo all'alto spirito onde Roma eterna è cristiana.

This final phrase (borrowed from Dante) echoed a theme promulgated by the ISR in the academic year 1936, which had stressed 'Roma onde Cristo è romano.' From Morra, we learn that Pius XII, while still Cardinal Pacelli, had contributed to these conferences, even publishing a treatise in 1937, under the auspices of the ISR.[26]

---

[22] La Penna 2001, 91.
[23] La Penna 1999, 608 and 612.
[24] La Penna 2001, 110.
[25] The photograph is positioned just before Fascicle VII (luglio 1939) of Volume XVII. There is also a benediction offered by Pius XI, in a similar photograph in the same volume, in Fascicle III, but Pius XII's is a more direct reference to his involvement with the Institute. (Remarkably, La Penna does not mention that there is a signed photograph of the Duce, positioned two pages after that of Pius XII.)
[26] Morra 1938, 622. The book, containing the works of Pacelli and four other

Moreover, perhaps in tribute to the man who would soon become Pope, the 1939 volume of *Roma* included a photograph of Pacelli's lecture to the Institute, the date of which is given as 23 February 1936.[27] Pacelli's ties and attentions in this period have come under closer scrutiny in very recent years, as evaluations of the Pope's actions, or better his lack of action, during his pontificate have become more critical.[28]

However, another, and perhaps even more illuminating, approach to this set of evidence is to sift through it, fixing on items that reveal the impact of Fascist theory and ideology on given elements of Roman antiquity. In his 1992 examination of the 'Roman' theme under Fascism, Romke Visser described the desirability of this approach in these terms:[29]

> Although the general tendencies in the ideological approach to Roman history by 'fascist' scholars of antiquity have been described by Canfora and his colleagues, no structural analysis of the major ideological publications has been made, let alone an overall study of the relations between the 'intellectual' cult of the *romanità* and the official, 'patented' fascist doctrine (e.g. corporatism).

A 'structural analysis' of this sort has been attempted here, and a remarkable amount of information can be made to fit precisely the 'patented doctrine' Visser identified. In fact, a careful reading of these documents, primarily through the lens of '*collegia* and Corporativism', provides a great deal of relevant comparative evidence, extending the view beyond the strictly 'scholarly' studies explored in the previous chapter.[30] At least three significant conclusions can be drawn

---

Cardinals, among several others, was published in '1937–XV' and had a total of 120 pages.

[27] *Roma* XVII, fasc. III (1939) Tavola XIII. The caption reads: 'Un avvenimento storico all'Istituto di Studi Romani: S.E. il Card. Eugenio Pacelli inaugura il ciclo di conferenze intitolato a "Roma onde Cristo è Romano" (23 febbraio 1936–XIV).'

[28] See, especially, Kertzer 2001; Zuccotti 2001; Zuccotti 2004; Taradel and Raggi 2000. Kertzer and Taradel/Raggi make important arguments for the role of semi-scholarly journals in conveying Vatican positions, at those moments when the Pope himself seemed to preserve a studied silence.

[29] Visser 1992a, 9.

[30] La Penna 1999, 624–625 identifies 'Le corporazioni dell'antica Roma,' as one of the frequent themes in the volumes of *Roma*, but he only lists a few of the articles discussed below. He does, however, make a significant reference to *collegia* scholarship in these years, and to De Robertis, observing, 'Ed è giusto ricordare che, non senza impulso proveniente dalla politica corporativa fascista, sulle corporazioni romane si svilupparono in quegli anni studi molto impegnativi e fruttuosi, degni di alta considerazione, specialmente a opera del romanista Francesco Maria De Robertis' (625).

from this material, with the third to be amplified in greater detail below. First, intersections of *collegia* and *corporazioni* appear regularly, and in a wide variety of contexts, throughout the full run of the journal, and especially in the 1930s. Moreover, an important functionary of the regime, Giuseppe Bottai, began his association with the Institute soon after he became Minister of the Corporations in 1929, and he continued it, on a regular and verifiable basis, while Minister of National Education, from November 1936 until his defection from Mussolini's government in February 1943.

And, perhaps most significantly, corporative theory and the Roman *collegia* were integrated into the renowned 'Mostra Augustea della Romanità' ('Augustan Exhibit of Romanness'), held between 23 September 1937 and 23 September 1938. This event was one of the culminating moments of the 'evangelical mission' undertaken by the ISR, and, like all missions, this one needed a text, or series of texts, to convey the substance of its new faith. For one of these texts, Francesco Lo Bianco was chosen to compose a pamphlet to accompany the exhibit, explaining 'The Organizations of the Workers' to the (estimated) 714,628 people who had visited the exhibit during its year-long run.[31] Lo Bianco's analysis, complete with plates from the Mostra, synthesized the arguments from his 1934 treatise for a wider, more general audience. Nevertheless, he then added a different conclusion, providing insight into the changing climate in which he was writing, as Fascism continued to evolve throughout the decade.

Collegia *in* Roma

At each of the four subsequent 'Congressi Nazionali di Studi Romani', documents from the first, especially one enacted on 26 April 1928, were read out, discussed, and printed by the attendees. In this text, the goals of 'Studi Romani' were defined and crystallized, with clear emphasis on the applicability of ancient principles to modern Italian life. The document took great pains to define what 'Roman Studies' were not, i.e. 'merely the study of Roman antiquities, ruins, monumental vestiges, or even the political, military, and social vicissitudes of ancient Rome.' Nor do they concern only the social conditions

[31] The figure, based on documents in the Archivio Centrale dello Stato, is provided in Scriba 1996, 21.

and other aspects of life in the city of Rome within a particular space and time. Rather, 'by 'Studi Romani' we intend to signify the study of Roman and Latin civilization in general; it is meant to signify the very study of the inner wellsprings and of the vital sap at one time, of our national civilization.'[32]

The rich and biologically derivative language did not end at this point, however. After quoting this document at the fourth Congress in October 1935, Galassi Paluzzi described how the journal *Roma* had been founded further to enhance these sorts of 'Roman Studies', and how the scholars involved in the Institute had managed to reanimate Rome with their efforts. The history of Rome has been explored, 'like a wonderful living unit, of which it is not permissible to produce an "anatomy", as if it were among the dead things, but of which there was need, so to speak, to produce a "physiology", as if it were among the living organisms.'[33]

The stress on 'life' and 'organisms' is particularly illuminating in this context. Blood imagery was frequently employed in the Fascist ideology of Romanness (and will be analyzed at greater length in the following chapter), but biological language was also one of the key components of Corporativist thought, concerned with the 'organisms' into which all the various levels of society would be incorporated, for the good of all the body's members. This is an apt metaphor for the way in which the *collegia* concept, as a manifestation of Corporativism, was treated in the pages of *Roma*, and in the proceedings of the ISR's conferences throughout the Fascist era. *Collegia* appeared in full-scale articles, brief allusions within other articles, and, very often, in book reviews, and these documents suggest the cachet of the image, far beyond the many monographs on the subject in the 1930s.

---

[32] Istituto di Studi Romani 1938, I, vii-viii: '"Studi Romani" non significa per noi soltanto—come per alcuni autori ha voluto significare—studio delle antichità romane, dei ruderi, delle vestigia monumentali, o anche delle vicende politiche, militari e sociali dell'antica Roma. . . . Per "Studi Romani" noi intendiamo significare lo studio della civiltà romana e latina in genere; il che sta a significare lo studio stesso delle intime scaturigini e della linfa vivificatrice ad un tempo, della nostra civiltà nazionale.'

[33] Istituto di Studi Romani 1938, I, ix: '. . . così che finalmente la storia di Roma e della sua civiltà fossero state considerate, e con rigoroso metodo indagate, come una mirabile unità vivente, della quale non era lecito fare l'anatomia, come si fa con le cose morte, ma della quale bisognava, per così dire, fare la fisiologia, come si fa con gli organismi viventi.'

In fact, such references became remarkably more pronounced in the late 1930s, a phenomenon that mirrors the significant increase in the volume of corporative studies over the same period. Moreover, these allusions reflect the same general trend, i.e. away from 'uninterrupted continuity' and toward the 'uniqueness' of the Fascist solution. In the eighth volume of *Roma*, published in 1930, there are only two abbreviated mentions of the subject. One of these is in a review of Aristide Calderini's *Aquileia Romana*, which draws attention to the funerary and, perhaps, professional roles of *collegia* in the city.[34] In the midst of another article, on economic relationships in the Empire, Filippo Clementi makes what appears to be a deliberate choice of contemporary phraseology, noting that, 'In Rome all the activities of production were organized in "corporazioni".'[35] In the following year, Gioacchino Mancini drew attention to the ancient Roman Vigiles, the night patrol and firefighting brigade of the city, listing the basic facts about the organization, but then drawing a remarkable comparison to modern-day firemen. Highlighting 'the promptness, the rapidity, the courage, of our brave Guardie del Fuoco,' he suggests that 'they are animated by the same spirit of discipline,' etc., as their Roman ancestors in the profession.[36]

However, beginning with the 1932 volume, interest in the subject began to wax, sometimes with unexpected results. One of the most bizarre agenda items of the ISR was its attempt to resurrect Latin as a spoken language, and this was one of the special priorities Galassi Paluzzi brought to his directorship.[37] This goal was first enunciated in the tenth volume of *Roma*, in a short article by the Director entitled, 'Per il rifiorire dello studio e dell'uso della lingua latina.'[38] Advocating the use of spoken Latin in the Institute (and with a preference for 'Ciceronian' style), he hoped that the dead language would

[34] Massano 1930b.

[35] Clementi 1930, 517.

[36] Mancini 1931, 547. The opening of a new fire station in Ostiense may have inspired this and similar articles. The station house was lauded (for its Futuristic design) by the Comandante del Corpo dei Vigili del Fuoco, Giacomo Olivieri (1930), in his article 'La nuova stazione dei vigili del fuoco', and a similarly 'scholarly' article was published by Massano (1930a), entitled 'I pompieri nell'antica Roma', in the same volume of *Capitolium*.

[37] The culmination of this program seems to have come in November 1939, when the Duce himself presented awards to the winners of a Latin prose competition at the Institute. A full commentary, together with photographs of the event, may be found in Galassi Paluzzi 1939c.

[38] Galassi Paluzzi 1932a.

be 'a living means of expression and of communication' for the present day, and one that would incorporate new words for new scientific and technological concepts.[39] A long report in the following fascicle (luglio 1932) lays out the process of resuscitation for spoken, colloquial Latin, and a top priority here was the formulation of the requisite vocabulary for new and important technical fields. Among these, he proposes that, 'Within the year there will be announced three competitions for as many lexical terms as possible regarding: a) Corporative Law; b) Electrical Engineering; c) Modern Philosophy and Experimental Psychology.'[40] This may seem a ludicrous goal, from a twenty-first-century vantage point—even though the Vatican still produces a dictionary of neo-Latin terms on a regular basis—but it is remarkable that Corporative Law was ranked alongside these more legitimate scientific disciplines, as a new and rich field of study requiring its own Latin vocabulary. This may have been a canard, of course, designed merely to curry favor with Bottai, who had been removed as Minister of Corporations in July 1932, while remaining the major intellectual arbiter of corporativist thought. If so, as will become clear, this seems to have been a shrewd move.

The project to revitalize Latin would, of course, founder on the shoals of the Second World War, but the plan was at least partially implemented in the context of the ISR, itself. A fascinating summary of their attempts to resurrect Latin 'come la sola possibile lingua ausiliaria nel mondo scientifico internazionale', together with comments from scholars from around the world, was published by the Institute in 1939.[41] The pieces in this pamphlet, and the articles, whatever their subject matter, in the published *Atti del IV Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani* (held in October 1935) were all preceded or followed by a short Latin summary. One remarkable example of this is the abstract of Francesco Sapori's 'Il Sindacato Romano Fascista degli autori e scrittori.' Despite the fact that the article

---

[39] Galassi Paluzzi 1932a, 271.

[40] *Roma* X (1932) 321–340, at 333: 'Entro l'anno verranno banditi tre concorsi per altrettanti saggi lessicali riguardanti:
a) il Diritto Corporativo;
b) l'Elettrotecnica;
c) la Filosofia moderna e la Psicologia sperimentale.'

[41] Rispoli 1939. Galassi Paluzzi described the goals of this effort in his introduction, entitled 'La lingua di Roma nel mondo e l'opera dell'Istituto di Studi Romani' (1939b, 2).

addressed only contemporary organizations of artists, the Latin epitomator[42] used Latin vocabulary—and not a terribly sophisticated style—to aver, '*Describit Auctor varia industriae genera Collegii; ex illis, quae perennem naturam habent, notandae sunt nonnullae expositiones librorumque venditiones, quos Auctores Collegii sodales scripsere.*'[43]

Up until the mid-1930s, however, interest in the Roman *collegia* was still limited to antiquarian matters, which were, presumably, more apt to elude official oversight than contemporary issues. One of the perennial subjects to emerge in these years concerned corporations in the Byzantine era, and this is reflected in a review of G. Zoras' book *Le Corporazioni bizantine*, published in 1931. The notice, which appeared in the 1933 volume of *Roma*, observed, briefly, that the book was 'in harmony with recent studies' on the topic, but Zoras' work managed to serve as fodder for another of Alberto Paolo Torri's articles, entitled, 'Corporazioni romane e corporazioni bizantine,' which appeared in the 1939 volume.[44] As he had in his other works on Roman *collegia*, Torri merely copied much of what had already been said by Waltzing, Zoras, De Robertis, and others, but he added his own unique touch with comments like, 'The Byzantine corporations listed in the "Book of the Prefect" number 22—by a strange coincidence the Fascist corporations also number 22. . . .'[45] There was also the clear assumption, in this period, that anything written on the subject must have a contemporary application, as revealed in Luigi Huetter's review of Mario Scapparo's *I collegi artigiani nell'epoca romana*, published in Tripoli in 1931. Huetter quite bluntly states that there is a reason for the appearance of so many books on the subject of workers' organizations in recent years: 'This renaissance, originating from the politics of labor pursued by the Corporative State, has given rise to a great quantity of publications on fascist corporativism and modern syndicalism and a smaller number on medieval corporations.'[46] However, he observes that there has

[42] This may have been 'N. Martinelli', who is credited with the Latin summaries in Rispoli 1939.
[43] Istituto di Studi Romani 1938, II, 516–522.
[44] Cecchelli 1933; Torri 1939.
[45] Torri 1939, 255.
[46] Huetter 1934, 522: 'Questa rinascita, originata dalla politica di lavoro perseguita dallo Stato corporativo, ha dato luogo ad una grande quantità di pubblicazioni sopra il corporativismo fascista e il sindacalismo moderno e ad una minore sulle corporazioni medievali.'

not yet been a similar uptake of interest in the associative behavior of Roman workers, and it is remarkable that this review appeared in the same year De Robertis (and Lo Bianco) began to remedy this oversight.

By the latter half of the 1930s, the Roman *collegia* were very much in vogue, not only in the full-scale monographs mentioned above, but also in the shorter pieces that appeared with the imprimatur of the ISR.[47] Among these the most remarkable are Cornelio Di Marzio's 'Il concetto romano nell'ordinamento delle professioni e dell'arti,' from the 1936 volume of *Roma*,[48] and Lo Bianco's oration on 'Il Corporativismo romano confrontato con quello medioevale e moderno,' which was delivered on 25 April 1938 and published in the *Atti del V Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani* in 1939.[49] Each article is a version of a study developed elsewhere, but their very appearance in these outlets suggests interest in the subject—as well as a basic familiarity with this material—among those affiliated with the Institute.

Di Marzio's article is a confused and meandering excursus on the role of artisans and other skilled laborers in Rome, at least as he had read about them in more specialized publications. At the time of writing, Di Marzio was President of the Confederation of Professionals and Artists, and, as early as 1933, he was speaking of a 'revolution of ideas' that would eventually supplant the French and Bolshevik Revolutions in the advancement of mankind. Di Marzio's interest in Rome was also of long standing, as he reportedly suggested, in February 1933, 'that the statue of Marcus Aurelius in the Campidoglio might better be replaced by that of Julius Caesar because "it is more worthy and representative" of fascist Italy.'[50] In keeping with these themes, the article denounces the concept of 'class struggle,' and suggests that, as in Late Antiquity, the Romans were right to put the State ahead of any perceived or imagined 'lotta di classe' in their own society. The piece seems to have struck a chord with

[47] Alberto Paolo Torri would, in addition to his 1940 book, publish a brief article in *Roma*, entitled 'Le corporazioni romane nei municipi dell'impero' [Torri 1940].

[48] Di Marzio 1936.

[49] Lo Bianco 1939b. (This lecture is followed by a piece on Roman population statistics by Jérôme Carcopino, the renowned author of *La vie quotidienne à Rome* (1939) and Minister of National Education and Youth for Vichy France, 1941–1942 [Carcopino 1939].)

[50] The papers of this influential 'intellectual' served as one of the key supports of Philip Cannistraro's article, 'Mussolini's Cultural Revolution: Fascist or Nationalist?' [Cannistraro 1972, 126, n. 40].

some of its readers, as Di Marzio reprinted it, with only minor revisions, in a 1941 Festschrift for the deceased director of the 'Scuola di perfezionamento in discipline corporative' at the Università di Firenze. (On the anti-Semitic elements contained in this piece, see below, Chapter 5.)

In similar fashion, Lo Bianco's speech parallels what he would publish on the occasion of the Mostra Augustea della Romanità (see below), but his invitation to this gathering, and the topic on which he spoke, suggest that he—and not De Robertis—had been judged 'the' expert on the Roman *collegia*, at least in the opinion of the ISR. That he was asked to write the official guidebook to the *collegia/corporazioni* portion of the Mostra is, accordingly, not surprising, although there was certainly a more deserving choice available in Bari. Nonetheless, this survey demonstrates that it was not only in the full-scale monographs that the Fascist transformation of *collegia* scholarship could be detected. Rather, such influence was widespread, even in the official and institutional bulwarks of 'Romanness' in the period.

Giuseppe Bottai and the Institute of Roman Studies

Considering more systematically the 'official' connections of the ISR, while Bottai was not the only Fascist in government to have reached out to this institution in the 1930s, he was clearly the one most interested in doing so. Moreover, once these links were forged—as early as 1930—Bottai was publicly associated with and committed to the mission of the Institute, as is made quite clear by his extensive publication under their aegis throughout the decade. There were, however, precedents for this more or less official endorsement of the ISR. At the first session of its second National Congress, in April 1930, one of Bottai's predecessors as Minister of National Education, Balbino Giuliano, made a standard speech about the relevance of 'Roman Studies,' as presently being conducted by the ISR, for modern Italy. Among other matters, he stressed 'the marvelous continuity of glory' that united the present to the past, one that also shone light on 'a luminous tradition of almost three millennia' that was now entering 'a new ascension' under the Fascists.[51]

[51] Istituto di Studi Romani 1931, I, 11, from the Inaugural Session of the Congress, 24 aprile 1930. Balbino was replaced as Minister of Education in July 1932, in a general shake-up of the central leadership. (See Figura 2000, 100–102.)

Perhaps the most visible illustration of this connection was the governmental service of Professor Pietro De Francisci, one of the leading classicists of his day, as well as the Minister of 'Grazia e Giustizia' from July 1932 to January 1935.[52] Rector of the Università di Roma and, according to Luciano Canfora, 'il più eminente romanista dell'epoca,' De Francisci was personally charged by Mussolini with the task of reforming the national constitution in April 1934.[53] However, such reforms had clearly been on his mind in earlier years, as he also contributed an article to the 1933 volume of *Roma* entitled 'Il diritto pubblico romano negli studi italiani del secolo XX.'[54] As he was the Minister of Justice, and soon-to-be spirit of constitutional reform under the Fascists, this article is of more than merely academic interest, and he pointedly claims, on the first page of the study, that he is avoiding 'empty discussions and futile curiosities.' The article specifically mentions Theodor Mommsen, Ettore Pais,[55] and Gaetano De Sanctis,[56] but it also makes brief allusions to contemporaries like Ettore De Ruggiero, Vincenzo Arangio-Ruiz,[57] and Arnaldo Momigliano.[58] His basic argument is that, in order to understand 'questo miracolo' of Roman expansion and efficiency in government, one must understand all of its constitutional and administrative aspects. Armed with this knowledge, the greatness of Rome could be duplicated in today's Italian state, as 'we Italians' are the direct heirs of that same people. De Francisci concludes the essay on a

[52] Figura 2000 (102) notes that 'Il 20 Luglio 1932 il ministero della giustizia e affari di culto ha cambiato la denominazione in ministero di grazia e giustizia.' Thus, De Francisci was the first to hold this reconfigured post in the Fascist regime.

[53] Canfora 1977, 94. Canfora cites Renzo De Felice's classic study *Mussolini il duce, I. Gli anni del consenso (1929–1936)* [De Felice 1974, 279–281], for the results of this reform, which seem to have been designed to weaken the power of the Senate. While De Francisci was an expert on Roman constitutional law, he seems to have advocated a strict separation of powers, and the consolidation of the Senate with both the 'Camera dei Deputati' and 'il Consiglio delle Corporazioni,' into a sort of 'Consiglio Nazionale' (280).

[54] De Francisci 1933.

[55] On whom, see now the essays in Polverini 2002.

[56] On whom see, *inter alia*, Cagnetta 1990b.

[57] In June 1945, Arangio-Ruiz had several of his essays on contemporary subjects published as *Schermaglie politiche* (Arangio-Ruiz 1945). Amazingly, these include several pieces he had written, generally in praise of the Duce, in 1922–1925, as well as those written after the liberation of Naples in 1943.

[58] Momigliano also contributed to one of the ISR's projects, with a piece entitled 'I regni indigeni dell'Africa Romana', published in *Africa Romana* (Momigliano 1935). On the complexities of reconstructing Momigliano's career in this period, see especially Di Donato 1995/8.

disturbingly prescient note, observing that the study of the Roman constitution 'imposes itself upon us Italians with the virtue of a command, because in this reborn nation we feel the throbbing of the spirit, the entire spirit, of our fathers,' and so forth, in a similar vein.[59] De Francisci continued to publish articles on Roman law, after he left government service,[60] and even offered several studies of Augustus in conjunction with the Augustan Bimillenary celebrations of 1937–1938.[61] However, in a thorough and well-reasoned article, Giuliano Crifò has demonstrated the extent to which De Francisci avoided adulation of the Duce, the 'new Augustus', in his sober treatments of the ancient emperor,[62] and his *Primordia civitatis* (De Francisci 1959) is still one of the most significant texts for Roman constitutional studies.

Oddly, though, it was Bottai (who was not a trained, professional classicist) who, both before and during his tenure as director of Fascist educational policy, made the longest strides toward official endorsement of the ISR and the fostering of its unique vision of 'Roman Studies'. Bottai's contribution to collegial studies, in particular, will be explored in the following chapter, but it is worth noting here the extent and depth of Bottai's ties to the Institute, when he was, one presumes, already busy with many other pressing affairs of state. The archives of the Istituto Nazionale di Studi Romani (the ISR's successor, from 1952 to the present) suggest that the first correspondence between the Institute and this prominent member of the Fascist regime took place in 1929. In that year, Bottai, then Undersecretary of the Corporations, was invited to contribute an essay to a projected series of publications, under the general title 'Studi Virgiliani.'[63]

---

[59] De Francisci 1933, 12: 'Tale dovere segna la via anche alla nostra scienza la quale subisce vivi ed urgenti gli impulsi della vita; a noi Italiani si impone colla virtù di un comando, perchè in questa nazione rinnovata noi sentiamo fremere l'anima, tutta l'anima, dei nostri padri, perchè, in questa rinascita che ci avvolge col fresco alitare delle albe sperate, noi vogliamo che Roma abbia ad essere sempre il centro ideale di vita di tutte le genti.'

[60] See, for one example, De Francisci 1936.

[61] Momigliano later drew attention to the quality of this work in his 'Gli studi italiani di storia greca e romana dal 1895 al 1939', originally published in 1950 and reprinted in Momigliano 1955, 294.

[62] Crifò, I, 260–261.

[63] INSR Archives, Serie 'Pubblicazioni', Busta 50, fascicle 1 (Studi Virgiliani). The file is arranged alphabetically, by authors who submitted, or were asked to submit, pieces to the final project. An interesting item in this regard is Galassi Paluzzi's letter to De Francisci, dated 28 August 1928, in which he humbly requests

It appears that Bottai had come to Galassi Paluzzi's attention on the strength of a speech he had delivered on the theme of 'L'Associazione Religiosa degli Oratori Rurali,' which was enthusiastically reported in a newsletter contained in this file.[64] In spite of alluding to classical ideas in only the most vague and general terms, Bottai had mentioned the spiritual dimensions of agricultural labor, and the applicability of this concept to the Christian centuries of Italian history. Regardless of any doubts he might have had, Bottai quickly acceded to Galassi Paluzzi's request, in a letter dated 15 January 1929, to participate in a conference on Virgil, to be hosted by the ISR in the Oratorio dei Filippini that April. The conference, part of a multi-year project to celebrate the 2000th anniversary of Virgil's birth,[65] was held on 3 April, and Bottai delivered the manuscript of his address to the ISR on 22 April.[66] By the time the proofs were prepared, in October 1930, Bottai had been promoted to full Minister of the Corporations, and Galassi Paluzzi delivered effusive praise, and warm personal sympathy, to the Minister in his letters of this period. Addressing him as 'Eccellenza e illustre Amico' in a letter of May 1931, he presented Bottai with the first volume of the series, in which his contribution had been printed, and then he suggested a plan of action, 'because we wish to give the volume the vast distribution it deserves.' Galassi Paluzzi seemed certain that, if the volume were accorded a favorable review in Bottai's journal, *Critica*

---

the latter's participation in the endeavor, employing a very charming image in the process: 'Caro Professore, Colla regolarità del Gianicolense cannone, vengo con questa mia a rammentarLe che non possiamo in alcun modo rinunciare alla pubblicazione delle due Sue bellissime conferenze su Virgilio, . . .'

[64] It is also possible that Galassi Paluzzi had seen Bottai's article 'L'esaltazione del Lavoro nell'opera di Virgilio,' which had appeared in *Rassegna italiana* in gennaio 1929. [Bottai 1929, and it is also attested in a bibliographic collection in *Roma* VIII (1930) 188.] This article was later reprinted in a collection of Bottai's works entitled *Incontri* (Bottai 1938a).

[65] On these various 'Bimillenari del Fascismo,' see Bandelli 1991, 390–397. Various essays offered for the Horace celebrations in 1935 have been edited and republished in Cagnetta 1990a.

[66] A notice regarding this event was printed in *Roma* IX (1931) under the title 'Studi Virgiliani.' There is particular mention of Bottai's lecture, and a description of its contents: 'Il Ministro delle Corporazioni, seguendo da vicino l'opera del Poeta, ha dimostrato come la concezione virgiliana del lavoro umano, che costituisce la chiave di volta del suo mondo poetico, e che è tanto vicino a quella cristiana, da esserne quasi una propedeutica, contenga un preciso e severo monito per la civiltà odierna: quello di ridare al lavoro il posto che gli spetta nella gerarchia dei valori morali e spirituali.'

Fascista, it would be widely disseminated and would influence opinion, both on Virgil and on the work of the Institute. The letter ends on a rather obsequious note,[67] but one that apparently cemented the relationship forming between the Minister and the Institute, a tie that would flower in the middle and later years of the decade.

Bottai's first appearance in *Roma* itself dates from 1934, when he published a brief article entitled 'Roma nella Mostra della Rivoluzione Fascista.'[68] This exhibition, one among many designed to showcase Fascist progress in industry, aeronautics, sporting prowess, etc., marked the 10th anniversary of the Fascists' March on Rome. Drawing on sophisticated and avant-garde principles of aesthetic design, the MRF was staged in the Palazzo delle Esposizioni (which would later house the exhibit dedicated to Augustus), between 1932 and 1933.[69] While Bottai would clearly have been interested in the representation of the regime which he had helped to create,[70] his article seems strangely out-of-place in a journal generally concerned with exploring the role of the ancient past in present times. In the piece, he did not allude to Rome's imperial past, but instead stressed the importance of Rome as a city, and specifically the significance of the March on Rome in October 1922 that had brought Mussolini to power.

Nonetheless, it was in 1937, after he had ascended to the Ministry of National Education, that Bottai moved into closest alignment with the ISR. In one of his most famous semi-scholarly articles, entitled 'L'Italia d'Augusto e l'Italia d'oggi,' Bottai compared Mussolini directly

---

[67] INSR Archives, 'Pubblicazioni', B. 50, fasc. 1, lett. ds., 21.5.1931, Galassi Paluzzi to Bottai:

> 'Eccellenza e illustre Amico,
>
> La prego di voler gradire in omaggio il 1° volume di Studi Virgiliani pubblicato a cura del nostro Istituto e che ha l'onore di essere arricchito di un importante capitolo a Lei dovuto.
>
> A parte Le invio anche gli estratti dall'editore dovutiLe.
>
> Poiché vorremmo dare al volume quella vasta diffusione che merita, mi permetto rivolgerLe viva preghiera affinché voglia far fare del volume stesso una bella recensione in 'Critica Fascista'.
>
> Voglia, La prego, gradire, unitamente con l'omaggio, i sensi rinnovati del nostro grato animo per l'onore che ha voluto farci collaborando al volume, e i miei più cordiali e deferenti saluti.'

[68] Bottai 1934.

[69] This exhibition forms the focal point of studies by Schnapp 1992; Falasca-Zamponi 1997; Stone 1998; Russo 1999; Benton 2000; and Fogu 2003.

[70] For his early life and career, see below, Chapter 5.

with Augustus.[71] This essay was, shortly after its appearance, sold as a separate pamphlet, and this was the first item in a new series generated by the Institute called 'Quaderni Augustei'.[72] Again, the archives of the ISR demonstrate to what extent Galassi Paluzzi, *personally*, nurtured the relationship with Bottai, and attempted to generate interest in and respect for his contributions to the Institute. In July 1937, he forwarded to Bottai a request from a new Hungarian journal to have this essay translated for and published in its first volume,[73] and he was insistent that Bottai's piece be published, as a separate pamphlet, that November.[74] Such arrangements were clearly designed to capitalize on the renewal of scholarly and general interest in Augustus, precipitated by the 2000th anniversary of his birth (23 September 1937), the day that the 'Mostra Augustea della Romanità' opened its doors to the public. Nevertheless, Bottai continued to appear in the pages of *Roma* throughout the significant year-long celebrations that followed.

For example, the 1937 volume also featured his 'Roma e Fascismo,' a lecture that had been delivered to the 'XXV Congresso del R. Istituto per la Storia del Risorgimento Italiano,' but which strayed very far from the theme of the Risorgimento itself.[75] Among other claims, he states that Fascism 'gives proof that the idea of Rome is operating through itself, as if instinctively, in the consciousness of the Italian people.' Roman history is not a 'morta storia,' but rather a living 'motivo d'azione.' He underscores here the critical need to reclaim that history from those 'foreign' scholars—he specifically mentions those 'oltr'Alpe'—who have 'misunderstood Rome and its historical function.' The clear implication here is that only Italians, due to their physical, visceral connection to their Roman ancestors, can fully comprehend the glories of the Roman past, and this theme is

[71] On the 'myth' of Augustus, and its manipulation by Mussolini and his followers, see Petersen 1983.

[72] The original piece appeared as Bottai 1937a, and the pamphlet is advertised, in a large box, on p. 228 in that volume. It was also reprinted in *Incontri* (Bottai 1938a).

[73] INSR Archives, 'Pubblicazioni', B. 217, fasc. 1 (Seria 'La figura e l'opera di Augusto'), lett. dss., 26.6.1937 (request from Hungary to Galassi Paluzzi), 7.7.1937 (GP to Bottai), 12.7.1937 (Bottai accepts the proposal). The article appeared, translated into Hungarian, as Bottai 1937b.

[74] Ibid., lett. dss., 10.11.1937 (GP to Bottai, on the proposal), 13.11.1937 (Bottai grants permission), 26.2.1938 (Bottai receives copies of the pamphlet).

[75] Bottai 1937c. On Fascist views of the Risorgimento, see also Fogu 2001.

continued, with extremely disturbing racist connotations, in subsequent pronouncements.

In his lecture on the unveiling of the Ara Pacis (23 September 1938) Bottai highlighted the points made by the Exhibit, which was closed on this day in an official ceremony, and by the revelation of the restored Altar soon afterward. All of the speeches of the day, including those made by Galassi Paluzzi and by Eugénie Sellers Strong (the former assistant director of the British School in Rome),[76] are recorded in an issue of *Roma*, published in October 1938. While also stressing the theme of Italian unity, he applauded the exhibit for placing the evidence of Rome's glorious past 'before the eyes of the Italians of today.' Moreover, he concluded that Rome's achievements were 'ours, autochthonous and original, not patterned on those of anyone else, but rather serving as an example to others.'[77]

And, as will be explored in the following chapter, it was in 1939 that Bottai produced his own monograph on the *collegia*, under the auspices of the Institute. It is, of course, a chilling reminder that, at the very moment he was researching these 'Roman' themes, Bottai was directly responsible for the removal of Jews from academic positions, as per the racial laws promulgated in the summer and fall of 1938.

Collegia *in the Mostra Augustea della Romanità*

However, another chilling manifestation of the intersection of Roman themes and Fascist propaganda was the Institute's major project of the 1930s, the assembly, promotion, and interpretation of an 'Augustan Exhibition of Romanness' in the fifteenth and sixteenth years of the Corporate State. The plans for a general celebration of Augustus'

---

[76] On whom see the biography by Stephen L. Dyson, *Eugénie Sellers Strong: Portrait of an Archaeologist* (Dyson 2004), especially 'Chapter 12: A Life and Death in Fascist Rome.'

[77] Speech made by Giuseppe Bottai, 23 September 1938, as recorded in Bottai 1938b, 404: '. . . infine, una Mostra, che avesse rievocato le glorie militari e civili di Augusto e della romanità. Un piano, dunque, che da Roma si è irraggiato in tutta Italia, ricostruendo dinanzi agli occhi degli Italiani di oggi il sistema della loro antica unità nell'ordine e nella potenza dell'Impero. . . . Cioè a dire: nostro autoctono originale, non dagli altri esemplato, ma agli altri esemplare. Di qui l'importanza politica dell'erezione di statue di Augusto, donate dal Duce a molte città d'Italia, le quali hanno voluto, in tal modo, più particolarmente, sottolineare l'antichissima nobiltà della loro origine romana.'

birthday were enunciated as early as April 1930, at the Second National Congress of Roman Studies, and this became a veritable leitmotif of publishing and planning over the next seven years. In his lecture 'Per il secondo millenario di Augusto,' Giulio Quirino Giglioli, who would become the director of the Exhibition and its guiding spirit, laid out the Institute's goals for the commemoration. The celebrations would be, self-consciously, very different from those of other Roman luminaries before the advent of Fascism, and they would be more comprehensive than those of 1911.[78] Rather, this would be both a solemn event and one that would produce 'enduring works.' Among these were five ambitious resolutions: 1. To restore Augustus' Mausoleum to its former glory, 2. To re-establish the Ara Pacis in its vicinity, 3. To restore all other monuments to Augustus in Italy and in 'the Empire' he had created, 4. 'The publication of a series of monographs of scientific character that will illustrate the history and the civilization of Augustus, of Italy, and of the Roman world, at the beginning of the Empire,' and 5. To promote conferences in Rome and in other Italian centers on these themes.[79] The impact of the Fascist building and restoration program on the vicinity of the Mausoleum of Augustus has, of course, drawn a great deal of interest, and each subsequent restoration of the vicinity (including one ongoing at the Ara Pacis) has been nearly as controversial.[80] Moreover, the extensive archaeological work at the site led to renewed scholarly attention to the subject by the ISR, as is evidenced by an article (complete with sketches of the site) in the *Atti* of the fifth Congress in 1938.[81]

However, the earliest public announcement of a museum component of this general celebration seems to have come in a lecture by Galassi Paluzzi, delivered on 29 October 1932 to the ISR in general session.[82] In the same speech in which he called for a Latin

---

[78] Giglioli had been Rodolfo Lanciani's assistant in the creation of the Mostra Archeologica in 1911, and was, by the late 1920s, 'rettore della X ripartizione Antichità e Belle Arti del governatorato di Roma' [Scriba 1995b, 69].

[79] Giglioli 1931. This speech is also mentioned in *Roma* IX (1931) 229.

[80] For extensive commentary on and photographs of the demolition and restoration, see Kostof 1973; Cederna 1980; Ridley 1986; Cambedda and Speranza 1995; Bellanca 2003; Painter 2005; and Wilkins 2005.

[81] Longhi 1939.

[82] Galassi Paluzzi 1932b. Letters between Galassi Paluzzi and Giglioli (dated January 1932) indicate that plans for the project were underway, and had already been proposed to Mussolini, by the early months of 1932. See Scriba 1998, 142.

vocabulary of 'corporative law,' among other desiderata, he observed that Mussolini himself had taken an interest in the Institute's initiatives, among them 'una grande Mostra [sic] della Romanità.'[83] The full title of the Mostra seems to have been formulated during the third Congress (1933), for which *Roma* records 'a lecture by Professor G.Q. Giglioli on the grandiose "Mostra Augustea della romanità [sic]", of which the Duce himself has been made the Patron. . . .'[84] From the very beginning, then, the Mostra was—at least in the minds of its organizers—directly connected to the regime, and there are clear indications that the Institute was not misguided in promoting this connection. At the fourth Congress, beginning 19 October 1935, the 'benevolent assistance' of the Minister of Education was specifically acknowledged, and Galassi Paluzzi drew attention to Giglioli's preparations for the 'grandiose' Mostra, claiming that the project had been 'presented to and approved by the Duce.'[85]

Official permission must have been procured to mount the exhibit in the same hall in which the Exhibition of the Fascist Revolution had been staged, and the arrangements for the façade and individual rooms mirror the design choices of the previous exhibit.[86] In his

[83] Galassi Paluzzi 1932b, 338: 'È noto che S.E. il Capo del Governo si è degnato di far Sua—e di fare così assurgere all'importanza di una grande manifestazione nazionale—l'iniziativa della quale già si era parlato in seno al nostro Istituto e relativa ad una grande Mostra della Romanità.'

[84] *Roma* XI (1933) 363. This was literally the case, as Mussolini had arranged for a disbursement of four million Lire to fund the event [Scriba 1996, 70].

[85] Istituto di Studi Romani 1938, I, 3: 'Un elaborato programma di manifestazioni nazionali per celebrare degnamente il Bimillenario Augusteo, che già era stato messo all'ordine del giorno fin dal 1930, nel II Congresso, particolarmente per merito del Prof. G.Q. Giglioli: programma che è stato preso in benevola considerazione da S.E. il Ministro dell'Educazione Nazionale [presumably Cesare Maria De Vecchi, Bottai's immediate predecessor in the position] che ha dato in merito ordini e disposizioni. . . .'; and Istituto di Studi Romani 1938, II, 51–62, for Galassi Paluzzi's report, esp. at II, 52: 'Inoltre, sempre in seno ai Congressi dell'Istituto, veniva elaborato dall'on. prof. G.Q. Giglioli il progetto di una grande Mostra in celebrazione di Augusto e dell'Impero, progetto che, presentato dal ch.mo proponente e approvato dal Duce, dava luogo alla grandiosa Mostra Augustea della Romanità.' [The latter piece is headed by a Latin summary, though there is an error in it—describing 1937–1938 as the anniversary of Augustus' 'death,' rather than his birth.]

[86] This is particularly striking in the case of 'Il Sacrario dei martiri della rivoluzione fascista', the center of the MRF exhibit, which boasted an enormous cross (inscribed 'Per la patria immortale!') that had been placed atop a pool of red water. In the MAR, the same room was reconfigured with another luminous cross, celebrating the birth of Jesus during Augustus' reign. (See Chapter 5, below.) The original room is pictured in Mulè 1933, 8.

article commemorating the opening of the exhibition in September 1937, 'Perpetuità di Roma: La Mostra Augustea della Romanità e la Mostra della Rivoluzione Fascista,' Galassi Paluzzi reminded readers of *Roma* that the exhibits had been paired deliberately, and that they were actually simultaneous at this very point. To celebrate the fifth year of the original display, and the fifteenth year of the Fascist rise to power, the regime reopened the Exhibit of the Revolution in October 1937, though in the Valle Giulia (the current site of the National Gallery of Modern Art). Thus, viewers of the two exhibits were clearly encouraged to draw parallels between them. In Galassi Paluzzi's phrase, the two Mostre 'stand as irrefutable testimony of the perpetuity of the heroic spirit, of the civilization, and of the idea of Rome, and, by opening them simultaneously, the Duce has wished to signify that they are complementary for the spiritual formation of Italians.'[87]

The organizers of the Augustan exhibit adopted as one of their core principles that the materials would be restricted to high-quality replicas of monuments throughout Italy and the former provinces of the Roman Empire, wherever these could be obtained.[88] Moreover, they mandated that the arrangements of the elements be thematic, rather than geographic, as the most comparable recent exhibition, the Mostra Archeologica in the Baths of Diocletian in 1911, had been.[89] There have been many analyses in recent years of the MAR, though virtually all have examined the Exhibition from the viewpoint of its aesthetic principles and its connections to other elements of contemporaneous Fascist propaganda.[90] While many of the indi-

[87] Galassi Paluzzi 1937, 353: 'L'una mostra e l'altra stanno a testimonianza irrefutabile della perpetuità dello spirito eroico, della civiltà e dell'idea di Roma, e inaugurandole contemporaneamente il Duce ha voluto significare che esse sono complementari per la formazione spirituale degli italiani.' This essay follows directly on Bottai 1937c, which suggests that the two articles were conceived as a set piece.

[88] Giglioli explained the rationale behind this decision, as an attempt to regularize and systematize the diverse elements into a pleasing, homogeneous whole. See, for one example, Giglioli 1938b, 56: 'La Mostra fu quindi tutta costituita di riproduzioni; il che, mentre dava l'opportuna omogeneità del materiale ed offriva il vantaggio di poterlo sistemare in modo assai più moderno che se si fosse trattato degli originali, non presentava alcun inconveniente estetico, perchè la tecnica delle riproduzioni ha ormai raggiunto una grandissima perfezione.'

[89] On the transformation of the earlier exhibit, see Nicolini 1983. Among others, Charles Picard, in his review of the Mostra, was struck by this contrast of theme [Picard 1938, 335].

[90] See especially Scriba 1995a; Stone 1998, 246–247; and Visser 1992b.

vidual copies that were housed in the exhibit have since found their way into other museums, most notably the Museo della Civiltà Romana in the EUR quadrant of Rome,[91] this approach is hampered by the fact that the original arrangement of the materials can only be discerned from a limited set of photographs, and from first-hand visitors' accounts, which, naturally, varied according to the viewer.[92] Nevertheless, the specifically 'Roman' elements have been overlooked in previous studies, together with the ties between the Roman theme and the racially-charged language, both spoken and visual, that characterized the regime at this crucial point.

While a comprehensive analysis of this sort should be undertaken, this study will be limited to an examination of the rooms (LII and LIII, on the Mostra's upper floor) that dealt specifically with the Roman *collegia*, and it will draw on accounts of the materials contained in those rooms, the descriptions of the items from the Mostra's official catalog, archival material related to the construction of this segment, and the pamphlet specially designed to explain these rooms to the general public. Again, though, an approach to the MAR, through the specific lens of the *collegia/corporazioni* comparison, sheds a remarkable amount of light on the Fascists' aims at this period, and on how *collegia* scholarship was used to further these goals. It also draws attention to the Fascist desire to popularize information about the *collegia*, though hardly in the interest of educating the Italian populace at large. The choice of Lo Bianco to aid them in the process is a remarkable case in point, and the pamphlet he created for the occasion of the MAR is a pivotal, though neglected, step in the development of *collegia* historiography.

While the lower floor of the Mostra highlighted (literally, with a luminous cross among its most prominent elements) the achievements of Rome's first Emperor, the upper floor fleshed out the religious, social, and cultural facets of life in the Empire over which he had presided. As he reported it for the art journal *Palladio*, Giglioli observed that, while the focus of the exhibit would be Augustus, the MAR would also 'include all Romanness,' from the civilization's most remote

---

[91] There were also plans to showcase the items in the 'E42' exposition, of which the current Museo della Civiltà Romana is a truncated legacy. On the planning for this event, see Mariani 1987; Gregory and Tartaro 1987, especially 120–121.

[92] See, for one example, Fremersdorf 1938.

origins through the beginning of the sixth century AD.[93] Among the thirty rooms dedicated to these aspects, two, composed of an antechamber and a larger hall, explicitly mentioned Roman *collegia*. The two rooms, 52 and 53, shared a general title, 'L'industria e l'artigianato,' and they were showcases, like the rest, for copies of items related to a general theme. Remarkably, these rooms mirrored their counterparts in the Mostra della Rivoluzione Fascista, which had been held in the same space five years previously. On the plan for the MRF, this section of the Palazzo delle Esposizioni was composed of three rooms, designed to elucidate the themes of 'Labor under Fascism', 'The Regime's Achievements in Agriculture and Transportation', and 'The National Activities of the Fascist Regime'.[94]

However, as the bulk of the MAR's items were, necessarily, funerary and dedicatory inscriptions in which individual workers, their crafts, or their types of worker organizations were mentioned and, very often, in merely fragmentary Latin texts, the rooms' designers were challenged with the goal of making them palatable to a general, and probably Latin-less, public. The task was made easier by one of the copies, of the famous 'Piazzale delle corporazioni di Ostia,' which was reproduced, in a 1:50 model, on an elevated table in the small antechamber.[95] The visual appeal of the item, with its graphic representations of many of the 70 separate merchant concerns, would have been felt by the average viewer, and one would, presumably, have come away with a sense of the economic benefits Augustus had brought to Italy and the Empire.

While, as one might expect, the antechamber was arranged by Guido Calza, the prominent archaeologist at Ostia Antica, the arrangement of the larger room was under the direct purview of one of the three principal members of the 'Directorial Commission' of the exhibit, Dottore Antonio M. Colini. Colini was also responsible for the design of most of the ground floor, as well as of the most remarkable fea-

---

[93] Giglioli 1937. Further, he justifies the approach to Augustus by noting, 'Se infatti l'età di Augusto fu politicamente il più memorando periodo di Roma antica, dal punto di vista artistico solo nella poesia e nella letteratura in genere fu il periodo più insigne della civiltà romana' (Giglioli 1937, 201).

[94] There is a sketch of the second floor plan in Schnapp 1992, and this may be compared with the one in Scriba 1995a, 402.

[95] This model can still be viewed, in Room LV of the Museo della Civiltà Romana. [Many thanks to Dott.ssa Clotilde D'Amato, for a personalized tour of this portion of the Museum, which is generally closed to the public.]

ture of the upper floor, the model of Imperial Rome in Room LX that is still one of the treasures of the Museo della Civiltà Romana.[96] Accordingly, Colini employed a similarly theatrical motif in this room, reserved for Roman tradesmen. Once one entered the room from the antechamber, through an elliptical foyer, s/he saw, along the left-hand side of the room, a series of five reconstructed 'shops', each displaying the wares of a particular industry, together with its related inscriptional materials.[97] At the end of the room was a reconstruction of a smithy, illustrating Roman prowess in metalworking in the imperial period, with a stylized, abstracted flame wafting up along the wall toward the ceiling.[98]

The archives of the exhibition, now housed in the Museo della Civiltà Romana, reveal the immense amount of detailed, careful planning that went into the construction of this room.[99] A series of pencil-written notes and memoranda suggest the difficulty organizers had in assembling and arranging these materials. One of these lists, headed 'Mestieri antichi e moderni,' arranges all possible Roman professions in one column, with Latin equivalents and inscriptional items naming them, alongside each one.[100] A separate list indicates the museums in which the original inscriptions were held, and from whom permission must be sought to produce the high-quality plaster casts that were displayed in the exhibit hall. The notes also contain extracts from books on Pompeii, especially regarding the

[96] Colini and Pietro Romanelli (who offered one of the tributes to Galassi Paluzzi in 1972) are, together with Carlo Pietrangeli, listed as the members 'Della commissione direttiva' in the Mostra's official catalog: Giglioli 1938a, xxi. The names of the directors, along with those of the other 'Studiosi che hanno collaborato alla preparazione scientifica della Mostra,' including Calza and Attilio DeGrassi, are listed here, and the room(s) over which each presided are also recorded. [Colini also authored one of the most bizarre, but still useful, products of the exponents of 'Romanità', a book collecting each appearance of Fasces in Roman art, entitled *Il Fascio Littorio, ricercato negli antichi monumenti* (Colini 1933).]

[97] Giglioli 1938a, 529.

[98] Ghirardo (1992) notes that the MAR was generally characterized by a more muted, less adventurous style than the MRF. While this seems generally to have been the case, one should not overlook the vaguely Futuristic elements that characterized both exhibits, and to which they were mutually referring.

[99] Thanks are gratefully offered to Dott.ssa D'Amato, who discovered photographic and other records relating to these rooms of the exhibit. The archive is not organized by room, and most of its materials remain unpublished.

[100] The full set of these items, a series of thin papers folded over double, is titled 'I Collegi antichi e Le Corporazioni moderne.' Thus, even here, the modern applicability of the ancient concept was never far from the minds of the organizers.

appearance of botteghe, which probably inspired the design of these abstracted shops in the room, and a lengthy series of bibliographic records concerning the *collegia*.

Particular attention seems to have been paid to the sentence inscribed on the wall above the reconstructed smith-works. The official catalog of the exhibit does not refer to this element, but an unpublished photograph of the room reveals that '*FABER EST SUAE QUISQUE FORTUNAE*' was painted above the recreated furnace. This tag, 'Every man is the smith of his own fortune,' was an aphorism attributed to the Republican politician Appius Claudius Caecus.[101] However, there seems to have been considerable debate concerning the quotation to be used in this context. At least three others seem to have been entertained, one a generalized sentiment '*VALEAT QUI FECIT*,' 'Let him flourish who works,' and two others drawn from Virgilian passages.[102]

What was the viewer to make of these items and their staged arrangement? Friedemann Scriba, in the first comprehensive analysis of this Mostra, catalogs a few of the major items in these rooms, notes Colini's supervision of the main sala,[103] and then explores the ideological message of each. While his categorization of the 'Grad der Ideologisierung' as 'explizit' and his characterization of its message as 'Museumsdidaktisch' may seem unnecessary to state, he wisely draws attention to the clear reference these rooms made to modern Fascist notions of Corporativism.[104] The Museum catalog, edited and compellingly introduced by Giglioli himself, makes these connections impossible to ignore. In his introduction to the detailed commentary on Room 52, Giglioli observes that, 'There are collected in this section documents illustrating the work and the production of Roman artisans. It is an illustration of their Colleges, which can be compared directly to modern Corporazioni.'[105] The paragraph goes on to describe

---

[101] The ultimate source is Sallust, *Ad Caes*. II.1.2.

[102] One was adapted from *Aeneid* VII.449–453, and the other from *Georgics* I.145. The latter is the source of the famous lines '*Labor omnia vincit, Improbus et duris urgens in rebus egestas*.'

[103] Scriba 1995a, 446–448. He is, however, mistaken in listing Colini as the 'Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiter' for Sala 52. The *Catalogo* attributes the design and oversight of the room to Calza.

[104] Scriba 1995a, 446. Throughout his study, Scriba addresses the propagandistic and aesthetic values of the exhibit, without exploring, in detail, the use of Roman history and classical scholarship in the MAR.

[105] Giglioli 1938a, 526: 'Sono raccolti in questa sezione documenti illustranti il

the means of production and export of Roman goods, explaining how small-scale, household-based industries eventually became sophisticated, Empire-wide concerns, and it concludes with an analysis of the workers in these industries: 'The workers in this category were assembled in professional corporations (*collegia*), which held strongly to their traditions and cultivated the interests of their associates.'[106]

The roles of the *collegia* were even more pronounced in the larger room, with a collection of inscriptions attached to the right-hand wall, arranged in three general categories.[107] The first group detailed the efforts of *collegia* to protect the interests of their trades, 'sia pure embrionale,' and these seem to have included a decree passed by the *navicularii* of Arles (*C. I. L.* 3.14165),[108] to the effect that the college could 'appeal to a superior authority, threatening a work stoppage.'[109] The next set of inscriptions (assembled at the far end of the hall) listed the officers, patrons, *magistri*, *curatores*, etc., of various colleges, explaining that these were associations of workers, with their own internal organization, boasting specific professional interests.

The final category is devoted to the 'Vita dei Collegi.' This description begins with the assertion that many colleges held assemblies, often merely for the purpose of banqueting, and Giglioli observes that this practice contributed to the creation of 'bonds of friendship,' that cemented the bonds already forged due to their shared lives and labors. In fact, he notes, the *collegium* had 'a recreational character that may, in a certain sense, be compared to that of our Dopolavoro.' This was a reference to the organizations of workers assembled and controlled by the State, providing both leisure and political indoctrination for working people.[110] The analysis goes on to state that their benefactors offered distributions of wine, food, and money, and that the *collegia*, considering themselves 'come grandi

lavoro e la produzione degli artigiani romani. È una illustrazione dei loro Collegi [sic], cui possono a diritto paragonarsi le moderne Corporazioni.'

[106] Giglioli 1938a, 526: 'I lavoratori della stessa categoria erano raggruppati in corporazioni professionali (*collegia*), che tenevano vive le tradizioni e curavano gli interessi dei loro associati.'

[107] As described in Giglioli 1938a, 543–545.

[108] The precise *C. I. L.* designation, and the museum in which the original text resides, are listed in the *Catalogo*'s *Appendice bibliografica e indici* [Giglioli 1939, 300f].

[109] Giglioli 1938a, 543: 'Se infine questo non basta e i lavoratori subiscono danni a causa dell'incuria di qualche magistrato, il collegio ricorre all'autorità superiore, minacciando la sospensione del lavoro, come sappiamo da un'epigrafe (pure trascritta sulla lavagna), riguardante i naviculari marittimi di Arles.'

[110] Further, see De Grazia 1981.

famiglie,' often reserved common tombs for themselves. In this latter case, the *Catalog* makes specific reference to a sepulcher of a college of wool-carders, a 5500 ft.^{2} plot set aside for the '*lanarii carminatores*' of Brixellum.[111] Finally, the colleges participated in funerals for their patrons, officials, and benefactors, and also performed funerary duties at the tombs of others, having accepted trusts for that purpose. Again, reference is made to an inscription that attests this service, though this is a common feature in many collegial texts.[112] The *Catalog* description of this portion ends strangely, observing, 'These functions ceased with the end of paganism,' though many of them must have ended long before that.[113]

There is no explicit mention of the Lanuvian inscription concerning the cultors of Diana and Antinous. If the text had been included in the Mostra, this would have been the most sensible placement for it, as it intersects many of the themes to which Giglioli had alerted the viewer. Nevertheless, the references to modern corporazioni and to the Dopolavoro clearly stress the *contemporary* significance of these items, and the Institute was careful to continue these connections in other publishing ventures spurred by the occasion of the Mostra. One of the stated goals of the Exhibit was to make Roman history, and particularly the legacy of Augustus, understandable to as wide a cross-section of Italian visitors as possible. There was a constant emphasis, throughout the entire Romanità program, on not leaving these analyses on the dry and dusty library shelves of an academic institution, but instead on making Italians 'self-aware' of their previous, present, and future roles as an imperial people. As 'm.p.' (presumably Massimo Pallottino, one of the academics charged with planning the Mostra) observed in the 1937 volume of *Roma*, 'The historical documentation will not thrive from a proper, austere, scientific life, as in the noiseless halls of the Museums; but it will instead speak with a direct and plain language to the public, of every cultural level and of every social class.'[114]

---

[111] *C. I. L.* 11.1031: 'DM Haec loca sunt lanariorum carminator(um) sodalici, quae faciunt in agro p. C, ad viam p. LV.'

[112] Among many examples, there is *C. I. L.* 5.337 (= *Inscriptiones Italiae* v. 10, fasc. 2, #19), from Parentium, which records the 'three measures of incense' offered by a '*collegium fabrum*' for the funeral of an adolescent boy.

[113] Perhaps the most spectacular failure of a college is recorded on an inscription from Alburnus Major, in Dacia. In a decree dated 167 CE, the *collegium*, which had functioned as a sort of burial insurance corporation, declares itself bankrupt and unable to provide 'even a single little plot.' For analysis, see Biró 1969.

[114] Pallottino 1937b, 254.

In an important article on the theme of the Fascist 'Romanità', which formed a part of the Mostra's title, Marla Stone has stressed how malleable and, thus, how open to interpretation this concept would have been, in the context of this 20-year regime.[115] Its precise meaning—never terribly clear to begin with—was subject to the changing circumstances within Italy, as well as in its inter-State relationships. As a result, in order to present 'Romanness' to the general public, who were presumed to be without specialized education in ancient political and social history, the Institute undertook an energetic program of marketing and explaining the MAR to a wide group of Italians. Throughout 1938, 1939, and as late as May 1943, it published a series of 21 pamphlets on subjects related to the Mostra, ranging in cost from 6 to 10 Lire and appearing under the general title 'Collana Civiltà Romana.' One of these, the sixteenth in the series, was entitled *Civiltà Romana: L'organizzazione dei lavoratori*, and was authored by Francesco Lo Bianco. The front page of the pamphlet contains the designation 'Mostra della Romanità' at the top, with the number 16, the title and author, and then a reproduced photograph of an inscription that seems to refer to the *Lex Julia de collegiis*.[116]

The pamphlet was not published directly by the Institute, but rather by the publishing house of Carlo Colombo—with the typographic assistance of, explicitly, the 'Camera dei Fasci e delle Corporazioni'—on 12 December 1939. The item appeared, therefore, more than a full year after the Mostra had closed in September 1938, but it contained photographs related to the Exhibit, most remarkably one of the Ostian Piazzale delle Corporazioni, reproduced on its page 32. The pamphlet is a mere 43 pages long, arranged in three chapters, with a conclusion, bibliographic note, and epigraphic appendix attached.[117] It also contains seven photographs, and it is written in a simple style, with clear, large-sized font, obviously designed to meet the mission 'm.p.' had laid out for this educational project two years previously. The content is, as one might suspect, merely a pastiche of Lo Bianco's 1934 book, which was, in its turn, a pastiche

[115] Stone 1999, 214f.

[116] This is a photograph of *C. I. L.* 6.2193, naming the 'symphoniaci' and including the formula 'C. C. C.' and a 'Lex Julia'. The pamphlet ties this inscription to Augustus (i.e. through the undated 'Lex Julia'), though this was (and remains) controversial at the time, e.g. Accame 1942; Berger 1947; Duff 1951; and Saumagne 1954.

[117] This last element is attributed to Nevio De Grassi.

of Waltzing's assertions, with contemporary references overlaid. However, there are remarkable departures from the earlier text in the opening and concluding pages of the treatise, and these draw explicit attention to how dramatically attitudes toward the *collegia* had altered over the course of the 1930s.

Lo Bianco opens this treatise by alluding to the importance of his subject, and its relevance to the average Italian reader: 'In today's historic moment, when Italy is perfecting and completing, more every day, its syndical and corporative organization, and many states seem willing to follow its example [i.e. Nazi Germany?]' there is, he claims, justifiably renewed interest in organizations of Roman workers.[118] Nevertheless, he takes pains to observe, 'This interest is not only among scholars who concern themselves with ancient history, but it is also and, one might say, principally among the public who wish to see how many of the ancient institutions may approximate modern ones and willingly observe how even in this field Fascism matches and is permeated by the spirit that animated the ancient Empire.'[119] Such is exactly what one might expect from a treatise of this sort, and for this occasion. Nevertheless, the rest of this page is a significant retreat from his previous confidence in the absolute parallelism of ancient and modern institutions. Perhaps with an eye to the regime with whose interests he seemed to be associated at this moment, he cautions:[120]

> It is necessary to stipulate, however, lest there be any misunderstanding of what I have said, that it is necessary not to claim too much for this point of view and that, while it is true that Fascism is connected

[118] Lo Bianco 1939a, 5: 'Nell'attuale periodo storico, mentre l'Italia perfeziona e completa ogni giorno di più la sua organizzazione sindacale e corporativa e molti Stati sembrano voler seguire il suo esempio, mentre anche negli Stati retti da regimi ben diversi dal nostro le organizzazioni dei lavoratori vanno assumendo importanza sempre maggiore, si risveglia un notevole interesse intorno a ciò che furono le organizzazioni dei lavoratori romani.'

[119] Lo Bianco 1939a, 5: 'Questo interesse non è solo negli studiosi che si occupano di storia antica, ma è anche e, direi, principalmente nel pubblico che vuol vedere quanto delle antiche istituzioni possa avvicinarsi alle moderne e nota volentieri come anche in questo campo il Fascismo appaia permeato dallo spirito che animò l'antico Impero.'

[120] Lo Bianco 1939a, 5: 'Giova però precisare, ad evitare ogni equivoco su quanto ho detto, che non si deve nè si può pretendere troppo sotto questo punto di vista e se è vero che il Fascismo si ricollega alla Romanità, ciò si deve riconoscere nello spirito col quale i problemi sono affrontati e risolti e non si deve pretendere di incontrare soluzioni simili per problemi che, a tanta distanza di tempo, hanno ben poco in comune.'

> to Romanness, it is also necessary to recognize the spirit in which the problems are confronted and resolved and it is essential not to pretend to introduce similar solutions for problems which, at such a distance of time, have very little in common.

There follows an elaborate contrast between the ancient economy, based principally on slave labor, and modern industrial arrangements. New and different social problems have resulted from the reliance on free as opposed to enslaved labor sources, and, accordingly, we should not be surprised that a network of workers' organizations, under the careful supervision of a State,[121] never reached modern levels of complexity in the ancient world.

The remainder of the pamphlet is a standard chronological review of the main signposts along the path of collegial development, but Lo Bianco pays particularly close attention to the innovations of Late Antiquity, when the State began to intervene directly in the economy for the benefit of all the Empire's inhabitants, i.e. by tying workers to vital hereditary industries. He draws explicit attention to this notion at the conclusion of the piece, averring:

> The study of collegial organization deserves, therefore, to escape the confined circle of specialists for the political interest it may also play. If, in fact, as I have said already, it would be absurd to insist on a one-for-one parallelism, it is not without significance to observe how, in every era, on the very soil on which today flourishes the Corporative State, there is a reinforcement of the tendency to form associations of workers, as well as the posing and resolution, in many different ways, of the problem of relations between these associations and the State.

Following another paragraph, he adds, 'By resolving the problem of conflicts between capital and labor, our Leader has not been part of this historical continuity.'[122] Thus, while economic relations have changed with industrialization, and new classes have been formed as a result, the Fascists have overcome the natural antagonisms created by these changes by endorsing their Imperial forebears' model.

---

[121] 'Stato' is, per usual Fascist practice, capitalized throughout.

[122] Lo Bianco 1939a, 35: 'Lo studio dell'organizzazione collegiale merita poi di uscire dalla cerchia ristretta degli specializzati per l'interesse anche politico che può rappresentare. Se infatti, come ho già detto, sarebbe assurdo stabilire un qualsiasi parallelismo, non è senza significato notare come in ogni tempo su questo suolo ove oggi prospera lo Stato Corporativo si sia affermata la tendenza al formarsi di associazioni di lavoratori, sia stato posto e risolto in modo sempre diverso il problema dei rapporti tra queste associazioni e lo Stato.'

By putting the State at the head of the entire nation, and by directly controlling industrial and economic organization from the top down, the Corporative State has circumvented all class struggle, exactly as the Romans of the Late Empire did. In a rhetorically-sophisticated (it includes one 14-line sentence!) series of paragraphs, Lo Bianco argues that this is the true legacy of Rome in regard to the *collegia*, and the one that the Fascists, reasonably enough, have found most suitable for their goals. The Late Empire is 'not, in fact, as many still believe today, the sad period of decadence of an enervated race, but rather it is the heroic period that reveals a State that managed to immobilize for centuries one of those grandiose natural phenomena that are the migrations of peoples.'[123]

The 'Note Bibliografiche' (37–39) reinforce the conclusion he has made here, as he deliberately draws attention to the 'primitiva forma embrionale' of *collegia* in the Roman world. They were not fully formed, by any means, in antiquity, but there are hints of the Corporative State yet to be born on Italian soil, if only in the final centuries of the Empire. He claims to have written his own book on the subject (in 1934) because the transformation from free *collegia* to obligatory *corpora* had not been studied with sufficient care in previous studies.[124] He makes brief allusion to Bandini (misspelled 'Banvini' here), Monti, and De Robertis, but he does not mention De Robertis' book of 1938. Notwithstanding this omission, it seems clear that De Robertis was, even at this early date, the recognized authority on the topic, and that his mode of thinking about the *collegia*, as enunciated in his 1934 article, had influenced subsequent analyses. It had become the standard line, it appears, to see inklings of the Corporative solution in the Roman past, in keeping with the best spirit of Romanità. Nevertheless, one had *then* to explain how the past would fade in *comparison* with the present and the future.[125]

In precisely the same fashion, Mussolini's famous dictum, 'Le glorie del passato siano superate dalle glorie dell'avvenire!,' was chis-

---

[123] Lo Bianco 1939a, 36: 'Il basso Impero non è infatti, come molti oggi credono ancora, il triste periodo della decadenza di una razza infiacchita, ma è il periodo eroico che ci mostra uno Stato che riesce ad immobilizzare per secoli uno di quei grandiosi fenomeni naturali che sono le migrazioni dei popoli.'

[124] Lo Bianco 1939a, 38.

[125] Lo Bianco's treatise seems to have pleased the publishers of the series, as he was invited to present another, entitled *La Costituzione del principato*. This [Lo Bianco 1943] was published on 15 May 1943, and, as it happened, was the final work in the series (as #21). (Mussolini was ousted as Italy's leader on 25 July 1943.)

eled into the lintel above the Mostra Augustea.[126] Accordingly, it was acceptable, in the eyes of the regime, to connect modern Italians to their Roman counterparts, but it was preferable to stress that the modern versions were *improvements*, in every appreciable sense, on the ruins of the past. The germ of this idea would bear poisonous fruit in the final years of the decade, as 'the glories of the past' came to be seen as the special prerogative of the direct, and preferably Aryan, descendants of the original Romans. By this point, however, the ISR had become inextricably linked with the regime that had supported its efforts. Moreover, the 'Romanità' theme it had promoted came to be associated with a pernicious form of racism, formulated at and encouraged from the very highest echelons of Fascist power.

[126] Giglioli 1938b (57) equates this statement with the 'elevazione spirituale' that the Mostra is designed to effect in 'tutti gli Italiani.'

CHAPTER FIVE

COLLEGIA, RACE, AND ROMAN HERITAGE UNDER GIUSEPPE BOTTAI

The Mostra Augustea della Romanità seems to have performed the desired effect on at least one of the Italian citizens and distinguished foreign visitors who purchased tickets to see it in the fifteenth and sixteenth years of the Corporative State.[1] On 23 September 1938, Mussolini officially closed the year-long 'Augustan Demonstration of Romanness' and then unveiled the restored Ara Pacis, the two events constituting a fitting tribute to the reign of the 'new Augustus' and the 'Empire' he had created. Between these two ceremonial duties, he spent a quiet quarter of an hour with Giuseppe Bottai, his Minister of National Education, and Bottai dutifully recorded the substance of their talk in his diary that evening.[2] According to this entry, Mussolini mused on his Jewish 'friend' (his longtime mistress, in point of fact) Margherita Sarfatti,[3] who was 'intelligent, Fascist, the mother of a genuine hero.' However, he went on to recount that, five years previously, he had taken steps to disentangle himself from this woman, 'foreseeing that the Jewish problem would become an obstacle.' Given his position in the inner circle of power—and his close relationship with Sarfatti herself[4]—Bottai surely knew the full story of the rise

[1] Adolf Hitler also visited the MAR, on two occasions, during his official visit to Rome in May 1938. A photograph of one of these visits (on which Hitler was accompanied by Mussolini and Joseph Goebbels, among others) is reproduced in Nicolini 1983, 87. See below for more anecdotes from this 'special day', as Ettore Scola described it in his 1977 film.

[2] Bottai's speech in honor of the Ara Pacis restoration was recorded in *Roma* (see above, Chapter 4, n. 77). Photographs of both of the day's events can be seen in display cases at the Istituto Nazionale di Studi Romani, the postwar successor to the Istituto di Studi Romani (currently housed at the Piazzale dei Cavalieri di Malta in Rome.)

[3] On whom, see especially Cannistraro and Sullivan 1993. Renzo De Felice (1977, I, 81–83) alluded to this liaison in describing Mussolini's personal attitudes toward Jews.

[4] Indeed, the Archivio Bottai (Fondazione Mondadori, Milano) contains a long series of letters from Sarfatti, dated from 1923 until Bottai's death in 1959 (and thereafter to his widow). The correspondence suggests that they were on familiar and intimate terms, as she often describes details of her household and travel

and fall of Mussolini's lover, but then the conversation took an unexpected turn.

Mussolini recalled a heated discussion he had had with Margherita about a crucifix, and his surprise at seeing that there was no cross above the tomb of her son Roberto, an impressive monument that had been completed in August of that year.[5] Roberto, the 'genuine hero' who seems also to have been on Mussolini's mind at the moment, had died in the Great War, but his body had been recovered only in 1934. At that point, his mother had gone to great lengths to commission a renowned modern architect (Giuseppe Terragni), dedicate a sepulcher, and hold an elaborate ceremony over his remains.[6] The King had attended the ceremony in August, out of recognition of Roberto's war service—and, perhaps, in muted protest against the anti-Jewish laws that had been passed in July 1938—but Mussolini did not. The Duce was, as in many cases concerning both modern and ancient art, mistaken in his assessment of this building, as the tomb *itself* formed a crucifix, if seen from above.[7] However, he had apparently viewed a photograph of the tomb, and he reacted, in Bottai's presence, in a very strange fashion. The absence of the cross was not an aesthetic choice, but rather, he concluded, 'a sign of the invincible character of the [Jewish] race.'[8]

---

arrangements [Archivio Bottai, B. 54, f. 224, lettere mss., cartoline mss., biglietti mss., cc. 25]. Moreover, Bottai's son Bruno remembered that Sarfatti was a frequent guest in his family's home [Bottai (B.) 1997, 27–28].

[5] A photograph and detailed description of the monument (in the town of Gallio, near Rete) may be viewed at http://www.comune.gallio.vi.it/rete_civica/territorio/racconti/roberto_sarfatti.htm, and the plans for the tomb may be viewed at the website of the Centro Studi Giuseppe Terragni, at http://www.centrostuditerragni.it/pag44.htm.

[6] On Terragni, and Sarfatti's championing of him, see Eisenman 2003.

[7] A point made by Achim Preiß (1991, 137): 'Die parabolischen Krümmungen des Landschließung-Denkmals waren hier in strenge Winkelsysteme übersetzt, damit durch die Kreuzung der Achsen das Symbol der vier Himmelsrichtungen wieder eingeführt werden konnte, so wie es der zweite Entwurf für das Gefallenendenkmal in Como zeigte.' (Preiß is, however, in error in describing Sarfatti as the 'sister' of the deceased.)

[8] Bottai, *Diario, 1935–1944*, a cura di Giordano Bruno Guerri (Bottai [1982]), 134: '*23 SETTEMBRE 1938, Roma—Mussolini e gli ebrei.* Ò una conferma diretta di quanto mi aveva confidato Thaon. Tra la cerimonia militare dinnanzi alla Mostra Augustea e l'inaugurazione dell'Ara Pacis, resto un quarto d'ora con Mussolini. [Mancano sette righe]. "Anch'io ho avuto un'amica ebrea: la Sarfatti. Intelligente, fascista, madre d'un autentico eroe. Eppure, cinque anni fa, prevedendo che il problema ebraico ci si sarebbe imposto, io ò provveduto a liberarmene. La feci licenziare dal 'Popolo d'Italia' e dalla direzione di 'Gerarchia' . . . con regolare liquidazione, si intende". Narra, poi, d'una sua discussione con Margherita sur un crocefisso, e

While this anecdote is known to the (many) modern biographers of Bottai and historians of Fascist Italy, little attention has been paid to the immediate *context* in which this remarkable conversation took place. The bizarre congeries of ideas in the passage is, however, directly related to the Mostra Augustea, to the deliberate arrangement of its materials, and to the misappropriation of the classical past that had taken place within its walls over the previous year. By analyzing first-hand, contemporary accounts and visual records of the exhibit, one can infer that it was no accident that the image of a 'cross' was wafting in the Duce's mind long enough to be pulled down into this conversation with Bottai. Moreover, it was not merely Mussolini's idiosyncratic interpretation that equated the cross with a specifically racist concept—the materials reveal, to a disturbing extent, how often Rome, 'the Roman people', 'Christian Rome', and similar notions were presented in deliberately racialized terms, for the propagandistic benefit of the Fascist regime, and at this very significant moment for Italy and Europe as a whole.

Two of the MAR's rooms, in particular, presented a streamlined synthesis of pagan and Christian Rome, and photographs reveal the powerful visual language that the crucifix was designed to lend the exhibit. The Mostra boasted at least two gigantic and luminous crosses, placed in the pivotal halls X (on the 'Genius Augusti') and XXV ('Il Cristianesimo').[9] In both cases, the crosses stretched from the floor to the ceiling, and the former contained the inscribed words (in Latin) of the opening of the Gospel of Luke's second chapter. The intent seems to have been to remind visitors (should they need to be reminded) that Jesus had been born in the reign of Augustus. The crosses left a vivid impression on Eugénie Sellers Strong, the renowned former Assistant Director of the British School at Rome,[10] who recorded her observations for the 1939 volume of *The Journal of Roman Studies*. Commenting on the inscribed cross, she noted,

---

della sua sorpresa nel vedere la tomba del figlio Roberto senza croce: segni, commenta, dell'invincibile carattere della razza.' The seven missing lines are also missing in the diary's original manuscripts, which are housed today in the Archivio Bottai. It appears that they were erased by the author, though it is impossible to determine at what point. Portions of this remarkable diary were published as Bottai 1949, and Guerri gained permission from the family to publish the full record after Bottai's death (in 1959).

[9] The latter can still be seen in Room X of the Museo della Civiltà Romana, though it is a simple, unadorned—and unilluminated—fixture today.

[10] See especially the biography by Dyson 2004.

'Possibly no feature of the Exhibition attracted more attention, the fact that Christ was born in the reign of Augustus having of recent years been brought into fresh prominence.'[11] Massimo Pallottino, who was one of the consultants for the exhibition, also described this feature in rapturous terms for the Roman journal *Capitolium*, observing that 'the luminous cross,' among the other items related to Augustus, 'is the heart of the Mostra, directly accessible from the atrium of the victories and from the gallery of the imperial triumphs. Around this room, through the entirety of the principal floor [of the exhibit], unfolds the historical recollection of the ascent, apogee, and continuity of Rome.'[12]

'Heart' is a particularly apt metaphor to use in this context, as the language of 'race', 'inheritance', and 'blood' was often used in this period, to describe the modern Italian connection to the ancient Roman past. If I am right in concluding that these cruciform images and the other events of this 'Roman' day culminated in Mussolini's comments on Jews, and, specifically, on their alienation from this Romanized past, this conclusion was not unique to the Duce. In fact, this incident underscores the racialized aspects of Fascist political and cultural policy at this point in the regime. The anti-Semitic laws had been introduced in July of that year,[13] and, on 9 November, Kristallnacht would furnish unmistakable proof of the pogrom Hitler had begun when he became Reichskanzler in January 1933. However, the context and tenor of Mussolini's remarks reveal much more than this general milieu. While the Mostra had attempted to connect the Rome of Augustus with the Rome of the Church with the Rome that had recently reclaimed its imperial mission in the modern world, it also celebrated the unique character of 'the Italian race' through

[11] Strong 1939, 148. She went on to observe, 'It cannot be denied that from the time of Augustus a new thread is worked into the richly patterned Roman fabric. . . . All this the "Mostra" brought out with admirable precision, making it possible to trace the stages through which *Romanità* passed till, purged of its pagan elements, its perfect amalgamation with Christianity could be effected' (150).

[12] Pallottino 1937a, 523: 'È per questo che la sala di Augusto, con i suoi simulacri, come genio, come guerriero, come sacerdote, il ricordo delle sue imprese, il testamento spirituale da lui lasciato, la croce luminosa che ricorda la nascita di Cristo, è nel cuore della Mostra, direttamente accessibile dall'atrio delle vittorie e dalla galleria dei trionfi imperiali. Intorno ad essa, per tutto il piano principale, si svolge la rievocazione storica dell'ascesa, dell'apogeo e della continuità di Roma.'

[13] Much attention has been paid to these laws in recent years, largely in recognition of the 60th anniversary of their passage. See, for example, Sarfatti 1994; Camera dei Deputati 1998; and Capristo 2002.

the intervening centuries. In short, all of the posturing about Rome and Romanness was, as many other sections of Bottai's *Diario* reveal, deliberately tied to the racial theme, and it was designed to elevate 'the Italian people', while at the same time differentiating them from other, notionally 'inferior' peoples.

On 16 July 1938, determined to stress the 'arianità' of all Italians, and thereby to downplay their African, Semitic, or otherwise 'Mediterranean' connections, Mussolini had mandated, 'The concepts of "latinità" and of "mediterraneità" will be rejected in favor of "arianità". The "romanità" will, with reservations, be preserved.'[14] Three days later, Mussolini made an exasperated comment concerning the Manifesto del Razzismo[15] to the effect that, 'I am sick and tired—I have said it emphatically—of hearing it repeated that a race that has given the world Dante, Machiavelli, Raphael, Michelangelo, is of African origin.'[16] Noting that this origin theory was only a 'weak argument', Bottai then discusses the 'soluzioni graduali' that were to be implemented, by which Jews would be systematically eliminated from the army, political offices, and schools.[17] By 29 July, it appears that a counter-offensive was being mounted, to preserve as much of 'Romanness' as was feasible, under these perilous conditions. One of the other gerarchs advanced the idea of 'combining the idea of "race" with the idea of "Rome",'[18] and this seems to have been

[14] Bottai [1982], 125: '*16 LUGLIO 1938*—. . . Nel colloquio con Landra, Mussolini si sarebbe dichiarato un "nordico", nient'affatto affine ai Francesi, sì bene agl'Inglesi e ai Tedeschi. Avrebbe detto. "Del resto mia figlia à sposato un toscano, mio figlio una lombarda!", per affermare il costante istinto della sua famiglia alle genti più pure, dal punto di vista razza, d'Italia. Gli stessi concetti di "latinità" e di "mediterraneità" sarebbero respinti per l'"arianità". La "romanità", con riserve, si salva.'

[15] This 'Manifesto of Fascist Racism', promulgated in July 1938, 'announced that Italians were Aryan in origin and biologically different from Jews and Africans, who belonged to "extra-European" races' ['Anti-Semitism,' in Cannistraro 1982, 28].

[16] Bottai [1982], 125–126: '*19 LUGLIO 1938*—Ò parlato con Mussolini del Manifesto del Razzismo. "Sono stufo—à detto con impeto—di sentire ripetere, che una razza, la quale à dato al mondo Dante, Machiavelli, Raffaello, Michelangelo, è di origine affricana". Argomento debole, da giornale o comizio: una razza che ha dato Dante etc. può anche infischiarsene di venire dall'Affrica. Poi, à preannunziato, nei confronti degli ebrei, soluzioni graduali, tendenti a escluderli dall'esercito, dalla magistratura, dalla scuola. A Alfieri, che ricordava questa o quella critica straniera, opponeva essere la critica degli stranieri la conferma della bontà nei nostri provvedimenti. Sempre. (Il che, può osservarsi, renderebbe assai facile agli stranieri la manovra della nostra politica).'

[17] On the course of the debate in the Grand Council of Fascism, see Preti 1968, 135–144.

[18] Bottai [1982], 128: '*29 LUGLIO 1938—Ò chiamato Pende*, per sapere come si

amenable to Bottai, who stepped up his connections with the (so-called) Institute of Roman Studies and the other institutional proponents of 'romanità' in precisely this period.

In fact, the most famous, or infamous, scholar of the Roman *collegia* was, Mommsen excepted, this very prominent member of the Fascist government, who served as Minister of the Corporations from 1932–1935, and as Minister of National Education from 1936 until he defected from the regime in 1943.[19] The editor of a journal entitled, appropriately, *Critica fascista* (1922–1943), Bottai never achieved the access to Mussolini's ear that he desired, but he was instrumental in shaping Corporative theory (such as it was) and the responses of intellectuals to the themes and policies of the Fascist Party.[20] Nevertheless, Bottai displayed no real interest, nor any special competence, in specifically 'Roman' matters until the late 1930s, when he wrote a series of pieces, all related to the concept of 'Romanità' and its applicability to modern Italian society.

The culmination of this enthusiastic embrace of 'Romanness' was his 102-page pamphlet entitled *Dalla Corporazione romana alla Corporazione fascista*, published under the auspices of the ISR in 1939. The treatise appeared as the fifth item in a series called 'Roma Mater', printed

---

mettono queste faccende della razza. Si cerca di rimettere in sesto le idee; soprattutto, di combinare l'idea "razza" con l'idea "Roma". In una riunione, Alfieri interrompe Pende, Visco, Savorgnan, che parlano tra di loro in termini di biologia e di antropologia. "Per carità, mi sembra di essere tornato al Ministero delle Corporazioni, quando tiravano fuori parole e parole, che non riuscivo a capire!"' [This last outburst was likely aimed at Bottai, who had been the Minister of Corporations.]

[19] Bottai has been the subject of many biographies, and their titles suggest the complexity of his character, e.g. Guerri 1976; De Grand 1978; and Galfré 2000. Shorter studies, explaining the number of offices he held in the Fascist regime, may be found in De Grand 1982; De Bernardi and Guarracino 1998, 188–189; and Figura 2000, 300. Most treatments since 1976 have either supported or taken issue with Guerri's systematic biography, which was based on a great deal of previously unpublished archival evidence [see Panicali 1978]. However, others have suggested that Guerri was too sympathetic to his subject and overstressed the 'critical' element of Bottai's attitude toward the government [see Zagarrio 1976].

[20] The difficulties of Bottai's position, throughout the course of the regime, are nicely summarized in Mangoni 1974, 66: 'Il problema di Bottai è ancora una volta quello della costruzione di una classe dirigente, ma da una posizione di potere interna al fascismo stesso. Di volta in volta, questo tema verrà affrontato, apertamente, con la polemica revisionista e il dibattito sul partito, o, sotterraneamente, attraverso l'opera di sottosegretario alle corporazioni, di ministro, di uomo di governo, insomma, che però mantiene come punto fermo il problema del rinnovarsi del gruppo politico al potere, e dello spazio in cui tale rinnovamento diventi possibile.'

by the Institute in cooperation with L'Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro, the Fascist agency ostensibly concerned with the working classes and their leisure-time 'education'. As such, the individual elements of the series were designed to be accessible to a variety of individuals: simply written, copiously illustrated, and available at a modest price.[21] In the course of this quasi-academic treatise, Bottai both built upon the scholarly tradition concerning collegia *and* subtly transformed it, in order to highlight the (to his mind) original and innovative qualities of Fascist institutions. However, in order fully to understand Bottai's approach to the ancient evidence, one must take into account his other pronouncements on 'Rome' in the same period, as well as the general development of the concept of 'Romanità' from the early years of the regime until this moment.

While much work has been done on the historiographic antecedents and implementation of Fascist theory in the period,[22] as well as on the role of intellectuals in its development,[23] there has been a fundamental oversight in previous discussions of this material. Scholars whose primary focus is on the ancient past have not taken into account the role of contemporary theory and policy in shaping intellectual production in these years. On the other hand, modern historians, given their general lack of training in classical literature and society, have not appreciated how profoundly views of the ancient past influenced actual events in the 1920s and 1930s.

In the previous chapter, a structural analysis of the intersection of corporative theory and Roman *collegia* was offered, and its role in the shaping of the Roman theme was developed. However, one of the most significant conclusions of this analysis is also one of the most surprising. As Bottai's diary suggests, the Roman theme was never far removed from the racial theme, especially in the late 1930s. In fact, the fortunes of Romanness rose and fell with the success of the alliance with Nazi Germany, and previous studies have not

[21] The rationale for the pricing, at 3 Lire, is set out in an issue of *Roma*: 'Quando si pensi che ciascuno di questi volumetti è messo in vendita al modicissimo prezzo di *lire tre*, accessibile a chiunque, si vedrà come vastamente questa collana possa essere diffusa in mezzo al popolo e produrre fecondi frutti di elevazione intellettuale e spirituale.' ['Roma Mater', *Roma* XVII (1939) 291–292, at 292.]

[22] Canfora 1977; Canfora 1980; Cagnetta 1979; Cofrancesco 1980; Quartermaine 1995; and Giardina and Vauchez 2000, Chapter 4: 'Ritorno al futuro: la romanità fascista.'

[23] Among many other studies, especially Isnenghi 1979; Gentile (E.) 1996; and Ben-Ghiat 2001.

weighed the impact of these (admittedly primitive) anthropological musings on the status of Romanness.[24] Bottai's new emphasis on Roman themes coincided with the attempts of other figures, most of whom were closer to the Duce, to implement a version of 'Aryan' race theory, with the intended result of drawing Italy into closer alliance with Hitler. In this context, Bottai used Roman parallels—and contrasts from the Roman past, as well—to launch a counter-offensive against this 'Arianità'. In the process, he would accentuate instead the historical uniqueness and integrity of 'the Italian race', while de-emphasizing its supposed connections to other, notionally superior, races. The *Dalla Corporazione romana alla Corporazione fascista* is, therefore, not merely a historical curiosity from a failed regime. It marks a turning point in the history of the Fascist dictatorship, as theoretically objective (though this, of course, had never really been the case) scholarship became the tool of a totalitarian state.

Bottai on the Roman Collegia *and the Italian Corporation*

The process by which this curiosity came to light is, as is very often the case in a totalitarian state, relatively easy to trace, through a series of meticulously-kept and carefully-organized records.[25] These records have been preserved in the archives of the Istituto Nazionale di Studi Romani (the successor organization to the original Institute of Roman Studies, when it was reconfigured in 1952), and they have been systematically arranged in a collection concerning the 'Pubblicazioni' of the ISR. These documents, detailing correspondence between, most often, the Institute's Director and individual authors, are further organized by series title. Within this, three full Buste are devoted to the series 'Roma Mater', in which seven titles were published between 1939 and 1942. The bulk of this material, however, is composed of the correspondence between Galassi Paluzzi and Bottai, who was by far the most prominent author who contributed

[24] An important exception is Gillette 2002, especially 54–56, but see also Ben-Ghiat 2001 and Millon 1965.

[25] In his study of the mid-century totalitarian dictatorships, Bruce F. Pauley [Pauley 1997, 251] has stressed the role of bureaucratic inertia in maintaining these systems. The sheer volume of documents produced by the Stasi in East Germany (an estimated 6 million documents) is a remarkable case in point. (The ISR was, of course, never a government agency, but it did maintain correspondence with a number of government officials.)

to this series of publications.[26] It is clear, from at least one fascicle of the documents, that the ISR—and Galassi Paluzzi personally—had staked a great deal on the success of this volume. Dozens of copies were sent out, in two distributions, to the country's major newspapers and journals in July and September of 1939. Most of the accompanying letters (preserved in draft and in duplicate within the folder) stress the illustrious standing of the author, as well as the deliberately low price of the publication; a few are personal letters, signed by Galassi Paluzzi himself, inviting the journal's editor to advertise and disseminate it widely.[27]

This personal attention to the progress of Bottai's treatise is consistent with the relationship Galassi Paluzzi had assiduously pursued, with a man whom he clearly considered an influential and intellectually sophisticated government official. In fact, the project of publishing this work seems to have originated directly from the ISR. In a letter dated 18 November 1938,[28] Galassi Paluzzi laid out the parameters of the series he had envisioned—and explored Bottai's possible role in its creation. The letter begins with a reminder, and with lavish praise: 'My dear friend, Permit me to remind you that you have wished, with much gentleness, to engage me to cast a glance over the text of the fine lectures you have made the honor of presenting to our Corsi Superiori di Studi Romani, speaking on the Roman Corporazione and on the Fascist Corporazione.'[29] While it

[26] Some of the other contributors were well-known within their particular disciplines of classical studies. Among these authors were Roberto Paribeni (for two titles, *L'Impero romano* and *La Famiglia romana*), Salvatore Riccobono (*Il Diritto romano e la civiltà*), and G.Q. Giglioli (*Roma dalla Guerra mondiale al nuovo Impero*).

[27] INSR Archives, Serie 'Pubblicazioni', B. 160, f. 6bis. Among the newspapers slated to have received copies were *L'Avvenire, Corriere della Sera, Il Popolo d'Italia*, and *Tribuna* [the editor of which, Giuseppe Ceccarelli, received a personal letter addressed, 'Caro Peppino'.] Most of the letters contain a standard description, to the effect that, 'Il volume, che è di recentissima pubblicazione, fa parte della collana "Roma Mater" con la quale l'Istituto di Studi Romani e l'Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro offrono al popolo italiano, a mitissimo prezzo, tutta una serie di opere dovute ad illustri autori sui vari aspetti della civiltà romana.'

[28] A small memo, dated 30.10.1941 and addressed to Dr. [Ottorino?] Morra, identifies this is as a carbon of the original letter. The concession of authorial rights was of issue to the Institute as it was preparing the German translation (see below).

[29] INSR Archives, 'Pubblicazioni', B. 161, f. 15, lett. ds. 18.11.38: 'Caro Amico, consentimi di rammentarti che con molta gentilezza hai voluto promettermi di ridare un'occhiata al testo delle belle lezioni che ci facesti l'onore di svolgere presso i nostri Corsi Superiori di Studi Romani, parlando della Corporazione romana e della Corporazione fascista.'

is unclear exactly when Bottai delivered these lectures, it is tempting to connect at least one to a photograph still displayed at the Institute, of Bottai speaking to the ISR on 27 September 1938. Nevertheless, Galassi Paluzzi further notes that he has enclosed the proofs of one of the volumes the Institute was publishing in cooperation with the O.N.D., and he then describes the specific terms of this series. Due to the interests of the Dopolavoro, and especially because of the great expense that will be involved 'given the large print run of the volumes,' he would prefer that the book be limited to 96 pages of text. However, he adds that he would also like to supplement each volume with 16 plates, illustrating the themes and ideas developed in the text, as such.[30] In return for Bottai's concession of authorial rights, Galassi Paluzzi offered 2000 Lire—though the draft of the letter indicates that another figure had been placed here, and then scratched out—together with 20 copies of the resulting book.[31] Something in Galassi Paluzzi's offer (the opportunity to cooperate with the Dopolavoro, the large expected press-run, the money?) seems to have piqued Bottai's interest, as a handwritten note dated 21 November indicates that Bottai had accepted it.[32]

Whatever his intentions, though, Bottai seems to have made little progress on the manuscript until he wrote to Galassi Paluzzi, 'da casa,' on 8 January 1939. Recalling his obligation, he asks for advice concerning which portions of the lectures to leave out, in order to fit the prescribed limits of the collection. In his reply, dated the following day, Galassi Paluzzi does not provide a specific answer to

[30] Ibid.: 'T'invio in bozze uno dei volumetti della serie che pubblichiamo d'accordo con l'O.N.D.

Per precisi accordi presi con l'O.N.D. stesso, e soprattutto per le molte serie ragioni economiche che ci hanno data la grande tiratura dei volumetti, bisognerebbe rimanere entro 96 pagine di testo.

Ciascun volumetto dovrebbe essere corredato di 16 tavole fuori testo; e penso che non sarebbe difficile trovare tra quelle che possono riguardare le Corporazioni romane, quelle medioevali e i documenti (riproduzioni tanto del lavoro, sedute particolari solenni del Comitato Centrale Corporativo ecc.) le 16 tavole.

Potremmo noi stessi, ove tu lo reputassi opportuno, cercare di sottoporre al tuo giudizio un certo numero di tavole soprattutto per quanto riguarda la parte antica e medioevale, e per quanto riguarda la Corporazione fascista potresti gentilmente darci disposizioni in proposito.'

[31] Ibid.: 'Mi corre l'obbligo di aggiungere che l'Istituto si permette di offrire, come modesta indennità lire due mila *contro la cessione dei diritti di autore* [this was presumably underlined in 1941], e che mette poi a tua disposizione venti copie dell'opera.'

[32] INSR Archives, 'Pubblicazioni', B. 161, f. 15, lett. ms. 21.11.38.

Bottai's request, but he does reiterate the points about the illustrations, and the fact that the book will be widely distributed. From this point, work progressed quickly; the manuscript arrived in February 1939, and the proofs were received and corrected by the author in early April.[33]

Given the brief time allocated for the creation of the text, and the fact that this was one of the most active portions of Bottai's public life, it is not surprising that the result was a derivative, though also a well-written, piece. Bottai cobbled together this treatise from the works of—generally—reliable scholars,[34] but he arranged the material to advance two ideologically determined themes. First, modern Corporativism, as formulated and promulgated by the Fascist regime, is utterly new and unique. The economies of the ancient and modern worlds are too different to permit comparison, but, even if one did attempt to draw one, the revolutionary character of the Fascist corporation would be made obvious. Second, one of the key differences between the modern and the ancient versions of corporative behavior is the philosophical valuation of 'labor' in the corresponding societies. According to the Fascists, but not to the ancient Romans, work is 'a social duty,' one that is best planned and directed by an interventionist State. As such, the corporazione, as an arm of the State, is the highest possible form of social justice and economic organization, and it is utterly without parallel in any society—ancient, medieval, or modern.[35]

Interestingly, the general thrust of the argument seems to have been patterned on De Robertis' article of 1934, rather than on the

---

[33] INSR Archives, 'Pubblicazioni', B. 161, f. 15, lett. dss. 8.1.XVII [1939], 9.1.XVII [1939], 2.4.XVII [1939].

[34] Bottai 1939a, 93–97. This 'Principali cenni bibliografici' is arranged according to chapter in the treatise, and the modern sections are, as one might expect, drawn heavily from Bottai's own pronouncements on Corporatism, as well as those expressed in one of the journals he edited, the *Diritto del Lavoro*. There are, however, numerous errors in the ancient sections, including 'iusq'a' and 'Peters' (for 'jusqu'à' and 'Peeters' in the Waltzing citation), 'sodalitiis' for Mommsen's 'sodaliciis', and 'Rostovtzen' for 'Rostovtzeff' (94–95).

[35] The themes were clearly understood by one of the contemporary reviews of the piece, by Salvatore Marino, in *Il Libro italiano* [Marino 1940, 56]: 'Infatti il principio corporativo della coordinazione delle forze produttive con i fini dello Stato che è caratteristica fondamentale del nostro ordinamento, non si riscontra negli ordinamenti sociali medievali e romani. . . . Attraverso queste vicende, il fenomeno associativo . . . si svolge parallelamente all'evolversi della concezione morale e pratica del lavoro umano e dello Stato.'

more recent work of Lo Bianco. In fact, the bibliography reveals that De Robertis is the principal source for Bottai's chapters on Rome,[36] and one is struck by a remarkable similarity of language to De Robertis' article, throughout the treatise. At least three examples suggest that Bottai had absorbed the main themes and imagery of the piece, before he wrote this pamphlet. Recalling De Robertis' 'fulgidissima luce' of the Roman past, he observes that there is a general conviction that, 'in the light of the Fascist conception, certain ancient institutions, that were dimmed through a long silence, can reacquire a more interesting life and a more contemporary significance.'[37] He also employs a vivid image, reminiscent of the 'due cavalli' De Robertis had described, observing that the Fascist State, 'a light vessel battered by the waves of conflicting interests, does not have the control of its own body politic, and it lives precariously on the whim of particular, self-directed forces.'[38] There are also clear echoes of 'affermandone con sicura coscienza l'originale paternità' in a statement in the Conclusione:[39]

> Recalling the concepts more fully developed above, we shall limit ourselves here to underlining the contrasts or the analogies with the arrangements of the past, secure that the originality and wholeness of the fascist solution will leap to the eye from the facts themselves.

The superiority of contemporary to classical solutions is even implied by the image on the pamphlet's front cover: an excerpt, in Mussolini's handwriting, of the 'Carta del Lavoro,' which was enacted in 1927.[40] The 'Carta del Lavoro' is consistently referenced in the piece, as in Bottai's definition of 'work' in the Introduzione:[41]

---

[36] The bibliography lists the four earliest studies of De Robertis, from 1932–1938, and his is the only name with more than one work consulted in the composition of this section.

[37] Bottai 1939a, 7: '. . . e, altresì, la convinzione che alla luce della concezione fascista, certi antichi istituti, che per lungo silenzio parevano fiochi, possano riacquistare una vita più interessante e un significato più attuale.'

[38] Bottai 1939a, 11: 'Lo Stato, leggera navicella sbattuta dalle onde degli interessi contrapposti, non ha il controllo del proprio corpo sociale e vive incertamente alla meroè delle particolari, egoistiche forze.'

[39] Bottai 1939a, 85: 'Richiamando i concetti più sopra esposti, ci limiteremo a sottolineare ora i contrasti o le analogie con gli ordinamenti passati, sicuri che dai fatti stessi balzerà evidente l'originalità e l'integrità della soluzione fascista.' (One might compare Waltzing's similar sentiments, Chapter 2, n. 48?)

[40] For the complete text of the document, moved by the Grand Council on 21 April 1927, see Zecchini 2000, 77–84.

[41] Bottai 1939a, 6: 'Il Regime Fascista, lontano da tali posizioni e da quelle

> The Fascist Regime, far removed from such positions and from the extremes of the Russian formula 'He who does not work shall not eat,' has proclaimed that 'work, of whatever form—organizational and executive, intellectual, technical, and manual—is a social obligation. In this respect, and only in this respect, is it protected by the State' (declaration II of the Carta del Lavoro).

The visual elements of the pamphlet also highlight the modern applicability of this (seemingly obscure) academic subject. Among the plates inserted in the treatise are renditions of two paintings, both hanging in the Ministero delle Corporazioni, of Mussolini issuing 'La Promessa' to the nation's workers, and then delivering 'La Realizzazione'. Another presents a photograph of the Ministry of Corporations, with 'La Carta del Lavoro, incisa sulla parete dell'anticamera del Ministero,' and yet another displays the bronze doors of the Ministry, which were evidently patterned on Ghiberti's for the Duomo.[42] The final page of text (92) contains a line drawing of the cover image, purportedly a 'Prima redazione autografa del Duce, di parti delle dichiarazioni II e VII della Carta del Lavoro.'

The acquisition of this signature proved to be one of the most vexing problems behind the publication of the treatise. While the letters of 1938 and 1939 indicate that the illustrations were of particular interest to the organizers of the publication—especially given its targeted, and presumably non-university-trained, readership—Bottai himself seems to have had little interest in them. Yet again, the guiding spirit behind their selection and arrangement was Galassi Paluzzi and his assistants at the ISR. In his letter of 2 April 1939, acknowledging receipt of the proofs, Bottai left all the details about the illustrations to the editor. He vaguely suggested a few designs, sketches of distinctive syndicates or workers, or segments of a worker's contract, but he provided no specific requirements to aid in the process. Accordingly, throughout the late spring of 1939, Galassi Paluzzi attempted to supplement the text with appropriate figures—the most remarkable of which were two pieces of the Duce's original handwriting. Given the prodigious amount of writing Mussolini was (at

---

estreme della formula russa "chi non lavora non mangia", ha proclamato che "*il lavoro, sotto tutte le sue forme organizzative ed esecutive, intellettuali, tecniche e manuali è un dovere sociale. A questo titolo e solo a questo titolo, è tutelato dallo Stato*" (dichiarazione II "Carta del Lavoro").'

[42] Several of the other Tavole are drawn from photographs of the Mostra Augustea, according to the captions.

least reputed) to have done, finding copies of his papers would seem to have been an easy process. The difficulty, of course, was in securing his permission to have them reproduced. An entire fascicle of the Institute's Archives is given over to this process, and an original letter, from Mussolini to a medical captain, is included in this folder, presumably because the signature was clearly and boldly drawn.[43] When the book was in press, Galassi Paluzzi was particularly anxious to have Bottai's reaction to the signature on page 92 and to the other sample of handwriting on the cover. Hoping to get the maximum use of these items, he further asked, 'Please tell me if, in your opinion, I may, beyond this, opportunely display the image from the cover also on this page, where the text ends.'[44]

Instead of paying close attention to the illustrations, Bottai seems to have been more concerned with the accuracy and appropriateness of his text. The Roman chapters, in particular, reveal a close attention to detail, and a certain scrupulousness regarding the scholarly works upon which they are based. One of Bottai's main contentions is that, because of its reliance on slave labor, Rome's social system is incomparable to that of any modern society. In order to make this claim, he quotes, extensively, from an Italian translation of Tenney Frank's *An Economic History of Rome*, and he does not twist Frank's conclusions to suit his objectives.[45] The organization of labor in, primarily, 'servile hands' prevented the development of classes and class struggles, and thus poses 'un distacco profondo' between the past and present, in which 'no facile analogies and approaches to modern situations are possible' (23 and 32).

---

[43] INSR Archives, 'Pubblicazioni', B. 161, f. 17. The letter seems to have been sent by Mussolini to a medical captain named Dott. Gino Tamarolini.

[44] INSR Archives, 'Pubblicazioni', B. 161, f. 15, lett. ds. 23.6.1939: '. . . L'altra pagina di bozze, che pure ti invio insieme, è la pag. 92, dove è nuovamente riprodotto l'autografo del Duce. Ti prego di comunicarmi se a tuo parere esso oltre che figurare nella copertina può opportunamente figurare anche in questa pagina, ove termina la trattazione.'

[45] Long quotations are made, especially from the chapter, 'The Laborer' [Frank 1927, 330f]. In fact, Frank also made contemporary allusions that are often, and understandably, overlooked today. For one example, on 332–333, he compares the Roman proletariat to the American '"poor white trash"' who 'terrorized' the Southern states with raiding parties during the Civil War. 'Yet,' he cautions, 'we must beware of filling in the picture from modern conditions of slavery where a difference of race and state of culture has aggravated the evils inherent in the system. Apart from a national pride in his race, which the Roman like any modern possessed, there is at Rome no evidence that any slave was not considered a potential citizen and thought gifted with as good blood and keen intellect as his master.'

Unlike Lo Bianco, however, Bottai does not detect a change of direction and focus in late antiquity, as the imperial state began to intervene directly in the traditional economy. While, beginning with Augustus, the emperors initiated, 'in progressive and positive form, the first historical intervention of the State in reference to regulating the right of association' (54), the basis of the economy would have to change, fundamentally, before the full development of associative behavior could appear. After a remarkably long (and remarkably accurate) quotation from Waltzing, in Italian translation, Bottai summarizes the essential point of the comparison he has set out to make:[46]

> I capisaldi enunciati dal Waltzing—libertà di scelta, equa ricompensa, concorrenza—che equivale qui ad iniziativa privata, noi li troviamo formulati e garantiti insieme ad altri civilissimi principi, nella Carta del Lavoro e nella legge fascista sulla disciplina dei rapporti di lavoro, e fanno parte di tutto il programma *meditato e realizzato dal sindacalismo di Mussolini*. Ed è proprio il Fascismo che costituisce la garanzia perchè l'organizzazione professionale e l'economia non trapassino nuovamente, nell'epoca moderna, ad una fase di decadenza come avvenne durante il periodo in cui l'Impero romano tramontava. È solo con il corporativismo fascista che si realizza quello che è stato sempre, nei millenni, l'anelito di tutte le moltitudini che lavorano, e cioè una più alta giustizia sociale [emphasis added].

> The high points enunciated by Waltzing—freedom of choice, fair compensation, competition—which he equates here with private enterprise, we also find, formulated and guaranteed in tandem with other most civilized principles, in the Carta del Lavoro, and in the fascist laws on the discipline of the relations of labor, and they play a part in the entire program thought up and realized by the syndicalism of Mussolini. And it is precisely Fascism that has solidified the guarantee so that professional organizations and the economy would not pass away anew, in modern times, into a phase of decadence, such as that which came during the period in which the Roman Empire collapsed. And it is only with fascist corporatism that we see the realization of what has been stated so often, for millennia, the yearning of all the multitudes who labor, and that is the highest social justice.

As noted above in Chapter 3, it was fashionable in the Fascist era, especially in the latter half of the 1930s, to twist Waltzing's liberal perspective to justify state intervention in the economy. Bottai makes

---

[46] Bottai 1939a, 57.

a more subtle argument here: the Fascists have actually *assisted* the development of free labor *by* co-opting it under the aegis of the State. In this case, he could argue that the elements of true social justice had only been made available in recent years, and that the Fascists were providing it on a historically unprecedented scale.

While Bottai's pronouncements on Roman *collegia* owed much to the work of others, and while he did not advance entirely new or radical views of the ancient institution, the very *existence* of the treatise suggests the importance of the concept in official cultural policy. That the Minister would have taken the time required to research (or to review the research of others concerning) an ancient topic is noteworthy, but even more so is the fact that the treatise was translated into German and published, with a revealing 'Vorwort' by its author, in 1942. Entitled *Von der römischen zur faschistischen Korporation*, the work was translated (by an Elise Pross of Stuttgart), and published at Ghent in occupied Belgium. At least two of Bottai's earlier works on Corporativismo and educational policy had also been translated into German,[47] and he would make arrangements for another volume to be published in simultaneous German and Italian editions (see below.) Nevertheless, for yet a third time, Galassi Paluzzi was the guiding spirit behind this particular translation, as revealed in his Institute's archives.

The original impetus for the translation seems to have come from Dottoressa Pross herself, who had been a student at the Università Italiana per Stranieri at Perugia and had met Galassi Paluzzi there. In a postcard from Germany dated 26 February 1941, Pross asked whether the book had been translated already, and, if not, offered her services in the cause.[48] A month later, Galassi Paluzzi wrote to Bottai, describing Pross' 'keen interest' in the project and the fact that, although German, she had lived in Italy 'for a long time,' and he alludes to his having met her at Perugia. The proposal met with success when Bottai agreed to the arrangements with Pross on 28 March. On 10 April, Galassi Paluzzi expressed his gratitude for Bottai's consent, together with his belief that the translation would

[47] Bottai 1933 and Bottai 1939b. Bottai was not the only Italian Fascist to have been translated into German; one of his great rivals, Roberto Farinacci, was also accorded this privilege [Farinacci 1941].

[48] INSR Archives, 'Pubblicazioni', B. 161, f. 20, Postkarte, 26.2.41.

be widely disseminated 'among the people of the great allied Nation.'[49] The Institute also secured the permission of the Dopolavoro to authorize a translation, and its director, Rino Parenti, similarly hoped for the diffusion 'among the German People' of 'the awareness of the Roman and Fascist corporative Idea.'[50] Notice that both letters lay stress on the educative appeal of Bottai's work, and that both capitalize 'Nation' and 'People', apparently concerned that the Germans should value their wartime ally—for ideas, if not for battlefield triumphs.

Pross had difficulty in securing a German publisher—understandably so, given wartime conditions—but eventually interested a house in Essen by September 1941. She provided periodic updates on her progress, asking for clarification of particular phrases in April 1942, but the work would not appear in press until the spring of 1943. However, it appears that, at some point, Galassi Paluzzi found it necessary to propose a further addition to the text. In a letter dated 17 September 1942, and translated into German by one of his assistants, he requested from the Essener Verlagsanstalt permission to attach a foreword, written by the author, to explain the text to the German reader. The publishers acceded to the request, and a 'Vorwort' preceded the final German text.[51]

However, while the foreword develops some of the themes Bottai had explored in the Italian original, it also contains elements that could only have been meant for potential readers in Nazi Germany. Bottai claims he has turned his attention to 'das Korporationswesen' (and not 'das Vereinswesen,' which would have been the more standard translation) for specific, but limited, reasons. His goals are not to compare all available systems of corporative action, but instead

---

[49] INSR Archives, 'Pubblicazioni', B. 161, f. 15, lett. ds., 24.3.41; B. 161, f. 20, lett. ms. 28.3.41; B. 161, f. 20, lett. ds. 10.4.41: 'Eccellenza e Caro Amico,

> Ti sono gratissimo delle parole affettuose e della sollecitudine con cui hai voluto comunicarmi il tuo consenso alla traduzione in tedesco del tuo studio sulle Corporazioni, pubblicato nella collana Roma Mater.
> Sono veramente lieto che quel lavoro, di così felice struttura, e così indovinato non meno nella forma che nella sostanza, possa avere quanto prima la più larga diffusione anche fra il popolo della grande Nazione amica.'

[50] INSR Archives, 'Pubblicazioni', B. 161, f. 20, lett. ds. 9.5.41: '. . . Sono veramente lieto di autorizzare tale traduzione, nella certezza che l'opera—redatta con criteri scientifici ma ispirata a chiari intenti divulgativi—contribuirà a diffondere, tra il Popolo Germanico, la conoscenza dell'Idea corporativa romana e fascista. . . .'

[51] INSR Archives, 'Pubblicazioni', B. 161, f. 20, Postkarte 4.9.41; Postkarte 25.9.41; Postkarte 20.4.42; lett. ds. 17.9.42; lett. ds. 5.10.42; packing slip 3.5.43.

to stress points of contact between certain historical models and the specifically Fascist institution. He hopes the German reader will recognize 'die Originalität eines korporativen Systems', in particular for forging an interdependent relationship between the system and the State.[52] The implication, especially as developed in a later sentence, is that the joining of the political 'State' to the more loosely defined 'Nation' is a product of Mussolini's Italy, and not of any other regime or people. In fact, 'briefly, the fascist corporative principle creates a close relationship between the working classes of the nation and the State, for the attainment of a uniform and higher goal, served by the cooperation of various professional categories.'[53]

The foreword ends on a bizarre note, one that is not found in the original Italian treatise, nor in the German translation that follows. Rather, it is clearly designed to strike a chord with Nazi racial propaganda. The Fascist corporative principle, he insists, demonstrates to what extent 'the political, juristic, and organizational wisdom of the Italian People' is sustained: 'principles, standards, arrangements, functions of the system are based upon new political, social, and economic foundations, which have been recast in the fire of a revolution.' Moreover, he avers, 'Fascism does not repeat history; rather, it develops it further.'[54]

That Bottai drew this conclusion from his own treatise, and at this point, is evocative, and very much a part of the general intellectual turn he had recently taken in terms of 'Romanness'. The Romanità theme could be made to stress the originality and wisdom of the Italian people, who, rather than slavishly mimicking the past, instead took the best elements of their own (racialized) tradition, and

---

[52] Bottai 1942c, 'Vorwort', 5–9, at 6.

[53] Bottai 1942c, 7: 'Kurz, das faschistische korporative Prinzip schafft eine feste Verbindung zwischen den berufstätigen Schichten der Nation und dem Staat zur Erreichung eines einheitlichen und höheren Zweckes, dem die Zusammenarbeit der verschiedenen Berufskategorien dient. Dieses Merkmal—ein wirklich neuartiges, insofern es in anderen korporativen Systemen nicht nachweisbar ist. . . .'

[54] Bottai 1942c, 9: 'Aber eine Fortsetzung, die eine Weiterentwicklung der Idee darstellt, eine, die von der politischen, juristischen und organisatorischen Weisheit des italienischen Volkes getragen ist: Grundsätze, Normen, Einrichtungen, Funktionen des Systems stützen sich auf neue politische, soziale und wirtschaftliche Grundlagen, die im Feuer einer Revolution umgegossen sind. Der Faschismus wiederholt die Geschichte nicht, sondern er entwickelt sie weiter.' This final phrase may recall a famous saying that Mussolini was fond of quoting, to the effect that 'Mussolini fa la storia, Hitler la geografia.' [It is noted as an 'anonymous' phrase in Bottai [1982], 128 (for 26 July 1938).]

transformed them into something even better. This theme is brought to vivid, and even imaginative, life in another treatise Bottai published in 1939, also under the auspices of the Institute of Roman Studies, entitled 'Roma nella scuola Italiana.'[55]

Bottai's Historical Vision and the Transformative Effect of 'Roman Blood'

The major contention of this treatise is that modern Italians are the biological descendants, as well as the cultural heirs, of those who had created the Roman Empire, and, accordingly, it is the responsibility of modern educators to reacquaint students with the 'mystical force' of Rome, 'slumbering,' literally, in their 'blood.' Having reclaimed their own unique imperial destiny (after the 'Declaration of Empire' on 9 May 1936), Italians should strive to resurrect the spirit that had made that ancient empire possible, and the elements for this new birth may be found within every Italian's bloodstream. Bottai claims that 'the idea of Rome works on us through the perception of an unknown, one might say a mystical, force. . . . And, today, it is reawakened from the drowsing of decadence: blood of our blood, new life teeming from the sediment of the past, lives, operational, in the reality of the spirit that is aware of itself.'[56]

Bottai adds a very interesting reflection on the semantic inadequacy of claiming that the Fascists are launching 'a return to Romanness'; in fact, he argues, 'the quality is instinctive within us [Italians].' It is only necessary to extract the essence of Rome from the dusty libraries and archaeological excavations, and to 'recreate' it in the experiences of today's young people. However, one must avoid mere fetishism in this exploration of the past. The best elements of the Roman experience must be distilled, and then applied, in a thoroughly modern spirit, to the world as it presently stands. He stresses this concept repeatedly, as in, 'We do not wish so much to *inform* ourselves about Rome as to *form* ourselves from Rome: to form ourselves through a present-day, ultra-modern application of its unifying, coordinating, disciplining energy,' and 'History makes itself live,

[55] Bottai 1939c.

[56] Bottai 1939c, 4: '. . . l'idea di Roma opera su di noi per il sentimento di questa forza ignota, starei per dire mistica. . . . E, oggi, ci ridesta dallo assopimento della decadenza: sangue del nostro sangue, giovinezza pullulata dal sedimento del passato, viva, operante, nell'attualità dello spirito consapevole di sè.'

rather, by interpreting and continuing; destroying from time to time so that it can live again with a new spirit.'[57]

In a lengthy excursus, the Minister speaks of his own 'conversion' to the mystical idea of Romanità, and thus suggests the way in which the nascent Roman spirit, slumbering in the Italians' blood, could be reawakened to new life in the real world. He dates his own awakening to his experiences in Addis Abeba (as 'Civil Governor') in May 1936, from where he wrote to Galassi Paluzzi, himself.[58] As he describes it:[59]

> Confesso, che anch'io, come scrivevo a Galassi Paluzzi dalle terre d'Africa, nel 1936, nell'adolescenza ambiziosa di novità, nel falso intellettualismo critico della prima giovinezza, avevo veduto nel fantasma di Roma alcunchè di retorico. E definivo, in quella lettera, il mio amore per Roma, tardivo, nato, cioè, quando nella Marcia dell'ottobre, avevo riconosciuto una marcia ideale verso una Città dello spirito. È che, in quel momento, si effettuava davvero, in me, come in tutti gli altri partecipi alla gloriosa vicenda, la trasfusione della tradizione letteraria nella realtà. Che è, a propriamente guardare, rispetto a Roma e alla sua storia, la funzione della Scuola.

> I admit that I, as well, as I wrote to Galassi Paluzzi from African lands in 1936, in an adolescence ambitious for the latest things, in the false and overly-intellectual criticism of first youth, had seen in the ghost of Rome something of merely rhetorical value. And I spelled out in this letter my love for Rome, lately born, as it were, during the March of October, when I had recognized a march of ideas toward a City of the spirit. And that, in that moment, there came about in me, indeed, as in all the other participants in that glorious episode, the transfusion of the literary tradition into reality. That is the function of the School, to safeguard properly the regard for Rome and for its history.

---

[57] Bottai 1939c, 5: 'Noi non vogliamo tanto *informarci* su Roma, quanto *formarci* da Roma: formarci per un'applicazione attuale, modernissima, della sua energia unificatrice, coordinatrice, disciplinatrice'; 12: 'La storia si vivifica, invece, interpretandola e continuandola; distruggendola d'ora in ora per riviverla con spirito nuovo.'

[58] Notice that Bottai had already written an article for *Roma* before traveling to Africa, but that his article on Augustus, and on his ancient context, would appear in 1937. Another fascinating insight into his musings on Roman matters can be seen in the books he records having read in his Diary, including Robert Graves' *I, Claudius* (on 8 September 1936), and Tacitus' *Annals* (1 September 1937) [Bottai [1982], 111 and 120.] On his one-month official service in Ethiopia, see Schneider 2000, esp. 'Die Bedeutung der Sozialwissenschaften für das "Imperium",' 86–91.

[59] Bottai 1939c, 6.

The existence of this letter underscores the close personal ties that had been forged—albeit, one imagines, more diligently on Galassi Paluzzi's end—between Bottai and the Director of the ISR. Again, the Institute's archives, and one strongly worded letter in particular, make it clear that Galassi Paluzzi valued this connection extremely highly. *Roma nella scuola italiana* was published under the auspices of the Institute, in its series 'Quaderni di Studi Romani', and the initial request to publish it as a separate pamphlet, in a first run of 350 copies, came in January 1939.[60] One may conclude from this that Galassi Paluzzi, while making arrangements to publish Bottai's treatise on the Roman Corporazioni, was eager to follow this up with further installments from the pen of the Minister. Work on this brief pamphlet proceeded quickly, but, on 16 February 1939, Galassi Paluzzi sent a blistering memo to an underling concerning the editing of the piece. In a revealing statement, he thundered:[61]

> Mi sembra semplicemente inverosimile che dopo due settimane non si siano ancora inviati al Ministro dell'Educazione Nazianale [sic] i suoi estratti. Non meno inverosimile è il fatto che esiste un cartoncino delle urgenze che non si sia segnalato il giorno stesso delle pubblicazione del fascicolo l'invio degli estratti. È la prima volta che l'Istituto fa col Ministro una figura simile.
>
> It seems to me simply inconceivable that, after two weeks, you have not forwarded his proofs to the Minister of National Education. No less inconceivable is the fact that there exists an urgent memo, should the delivery of the proofs not coincide with the very day of the publication of the pamphlet. It is the first time that the Institute has behaved in this way with the Minister.

As one would probably imagine, the letter performed the desired effect: Galassi Paluzzi received a note marked 'urgent' in response a few days later, indicating that the proofs were completed. The following day, Galassi Paluzzi announced this news to Bottai, and he was very pleased to present the Minister with the first ten copies on 4 March.[62]

[60] INSR Archives, 'Pubblicazioni', B. 248, f. 1. The original manuscript, with editorial marginalia, of the treatise is contained in B. 304, f. 5.

[61] INSR Archives, 'Pubblicazioni', B. 248, f. 1, lett. ds. 16.2.1939.

[62] INSR Archives, 'Pubblicazioni', B. 248, f. 1., lett. dss., 27.2.1939, 28.2.1939, and 4.3.1939.

Nevertheless, Galassi Paluzzi remained determined to uphold and to further the relationship he had pursued with the Minister, and, as a result, the very letter to which Bottai referred here was printed in *Roma*—with much commentary on its importance—in 1940.[63] While the letter does, indeed, refer to the 'flowing of Roman blood' in his veins, the 'ideal march toward a city of the spirit,' and the 'false critical intellectualism of a youth ambitious for the latest things,' it actually goes a step further. Apparently writing in December 1936 or January 1937, Bottai had drawn a particular conclusion from his experience in Italy's new 'Empire,' and its significance for the reawakening of the 'Roman' spirit. Rome was, in his estimation, 'more than a Capital; it is a myth, it is the sum of universal principles, it is a force that, though brought low, will not bend, but rather, by being elevated, will straighten out the world.'[64] Throughout his tenure as Education Minister, Bottai stressed the importance of creating 'new myths' that could be made to interpret the events of the present day.[65] The Duce had, in his mind, furnished the source of these new myths, and historical parallels could be used to reinforce their meaning. In his letter to Galassi Paluzzi, Bottai went on to link the Fascists' imperial vision with the 'Roman' agenda espoused and further by the Institute of Roman Studies, observing, 'the work of the Institute appears to me, contrary to the opinion of the methodical enemies of culture,[66] who still enjoy a certain favor, one of the most useful.' In fact, to recreate 'the idea of Rome' actually 'means to work implicitly for the expansion of Italy in the world.'

This less intellectualized, and more militantly imperialistic, concept is what leaps out from this particular letter, and it is what, apparently, motivated Galassi Paluzzi to conclude that the letter

---

[63] Galassi Paluzzi 1940a. In 1940, Bottai published his reminiscences of his experience in Ethiopia, and Galassi Paluzzi was here expressing his appreciation for the work and its author [Bottai 1940b].

[64] Galassi Paluzzi 1940a, 191: 'L'italianità è in Roma; ma in Roma, tu intendi, che è già molto più della Capitale: è mito, è somma di principii universali, è forza, che non piegherà, umiliandolo, ma ordinerà, innalzandolo, il mondo . . . l'opera dell'Istituto appare a me, contro il parere dei metodici nemici della cultura, che godono ancora d'un certo favore, una delle più utili. . . . Rimettere l'idea di Roma tra le idee correnti dell'uomo contemporaneo, italiano e straniero, significa lavorare implicitamente per l'espansione italiana nel mondo.'

[65] Gentile (E.) 1995, 144–148.

[66] This is probably a reference to Roberto Farinacci, Bottai's perennial enemy in the Fascist inner circle.

stands as 'testimony of a new, definitive conquest of Rome over a man who, conquered by the gigantic Roman figure of Mussolini,' was working to recover an Empire.[67] In his recollections of these years, Bottai's son claimed that both his father and his mother understood—but were not taken in by—this rhetoric of empire. Instead, he writes, his mother thought that jingoistic language should be avoided; Italy was merely treading the path of conquest and civilization that other European nations, and most remakably the British, had already taken.[68] However, it is also clear that Bottai was fully proficient in this language, whatever his personal reservations concerning it.

As Mussolini had joined Romanness to Christianity, in his remarks on 23 September 1938, so Bottai, 'post-conversion', traced the essential continuity of Rome through its various stages of greatness, and he continued to draw on explicitly biological imagery to make this connection. Through the Church, he argued in *Roma nella scuola*, 'the civilization of the terrestrial orb took from Rome a new impulse [heartbeat?], that has kept itself going without stopping up to the present day, a visible inheritance in the entire Christian world of the Middle Ages and of the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation.' The appearance of Germany here is surely no accident, and he underscores the point by suggesting that, 'Anche a non essere di sangue latino, tutti sono figli della civiltà romana.' In other words, all Europeans—and presumably, every person around the world affected by the Catholic Church—could in some sense be considered a descendant, by blood, from the great Roman fountain, but Italians were the special heirs to this greatness. As such, they must claim that unique heritage by first discovering what Rome was, and then by improving upon that legacy.

---

[67] Galassi Paluzzi 1940a, 191: '. . . è soprattutto la testimonianza di una nuova, definitiva conquista di Roma su di un uomo che, conquistato dalla gigantesca figura romana di Mussolini. . . .'

[68] Bottai (B.) 1997, 20–21: 'Mia madre, felice anche lei per l'imminente ritorno del marito, commentò che la risurrezione dell'impero le pareva una figura retorica che si sarebbe potuta evitare: meglio, a suo giudizio, sottolineare che noi seguivamo la strada percorsa da tutti gli altri popoli europei, a cominciare dagli inglesi, che ancora si ritenevano, a torto o a ragione, investiti da un nobile compito di civilizzazione negli altri continenti e meglio anche sottolineare che avevamo bisogno di terra per il nostro lavoro, come dimostrato dai milioni di poveri emigranti partiti per le Americhe.'

As in the foreword to the German edition of his work on the Roman Corporations, Bottai thus drew upon typically Nazi and Nazi-inspired themes, here the sense of racial inheritance, by blood, and the sense of mystical and biological connection to the past, reanimating and respiritualizing a morally decadent world. Blood imagery appears quite prominently in two other academic works on *Romanità* that Bottai published in the early years of the Second World War. In 1940, perhaps in reaction to 'Okhi Day' (28 October 1940) and the war against Greece, he wrote, again under the aegis of the ISR, *La funzione di Roma nella vita culturale e scientifica della nazione*. However, the title does not reveal the fundamental thesis of the pamphlet, which is to stress the superiority of Roman to Greek civilization, when the two encountered each other in the Late Republic. Rome came into conflict with the Greeks at its own zenith, and at a period of Greek decadence: 'But [the Romans], if they did not have the culture, formerly the highest and lately decadent culture, of the Greeks, did have a *sense* of culture, that became their own from the fact that they possessed, in contrast to the Greeks, a civilization of solid significance.' However, instead of eliminating the Greeks' culture altogether, the Romans provided a much-needed, and literal, 'transfusion' of energy and talent. In a suitably bombastic sentiment, he writes, 'The paradox, therefore, between culture and civilization, that had brought the Greeks from a portentous youth to a sudden senescence, was ultimately resolved by Rome. The same Hellenic culture left it re-blooded, re-youthed, rather, one might say, re-made. The culture became Roman. . . .'[69]

Galassi Paluzzi made a similar argument in precisely the same year, and perhaps for similar reasons. His piece 'Grecia e Roma', published in Volume XVIII of *Roma*, begins by attacking British propaganda on behalf of the modern Greeks. In fact, he argues that it is obvious that 'the poor peasants of the Greece of today' have nothing to do with the shepherds of ancient Arcadia, nor could 'a little

[69] Bottai 1940a, 6: 'L'antinomia, quindi, tra la cultura e la civiltà, che aveva portato i greci da una portentosa giovinezza ad un improvviso invecchiamento, veniva da Roma risolta. La stessa cultura ellenica ne usciva rinsanguata, ringiovanita, anzi, diciamo meglio, rifatta.' This is probably a reference to the second stanza of the Fascist anthem 'Giovinezza', which reads, 'Dell'Italia nei confini/ Son rifatti gli Italiani/ Li ha rifatti Mussolini/ Per la guerra di domani.' [Many thanks to Prof. Luigi Ferri for this suggestion.]

ass of Pantelleria' have anything to do with the Trojan Horse.[70] While he confesses that he has no wish to denigrate the achievements of the ancient Greeks only in order to emphasize those of the Romans, he adds that Greece provided the mere elements of a great culture. The *spirit*, the essential magic that makes a civilization truly admirable, was lacking, and this would come only with the advent of the Romans.[71] In his treatise, Bottai made fundamentally the same argument, laying stress on the 'spiritual' elements that inspired Roman greatness—and have survived, intact, among modern Italians to revive that civilization once again. As he notes, all the monuments of Rome, whether pagan, Christian, ancient, medieval, or Renaissance 'are not only works of art; but, above all, [exist] as living things, present and actively engaged.'[72] Whatever their grandeur, ruins are mere stones unless they are infused with a spirit, the spirit that has survived in the blood of the modern Italian. Thus, he claims, all Italians today feel, instinctively, the 'full, triumphant return of Rome' as a 'sense and a symbol of a necessary continuity, of blood and of spirit, in the past and in the future, of our civilization.'[73]

Thus, Bottai's essay begins with the comparison of Greek and Roman achievements, and it concludes with a grand rhetorical flight on the theme of the 'spiritual' nature of the Romanità project. However, it was also part of a subtle, but extremely important, competition that had arisen, especially in the late 1930s, between Italy and her ally, Nazi Germany. It is virtually impossible for us, nearly 70 years later, to envision a world in which comparisons between ancient Greek and Roman art could be transformed into high politics,

---

[70] Galassi Paluzzi 1940b, 329: 'Che poi i poveri contadini della Grecia di oggi abbiano a che fare con i pastori di Arcadia dell'Ellade che fu, come un asinello di Pantelleria ha a che fare col cavallo di Troia. . . .'

[71] Galassi Paluzzi 1940b, 330: 'Ripetiamo dunque che l'Ellade ha dato a Roma degli elementi ma non lo spirito: degli elementi meravigliosi e talvolta sublimi, che hanno permesso lo sviluppo di determinate sensibilità e, se si vuole, anche di talune facoltà latenti nella civiltà romana; ma che, pur influenzandolo profondamente, non hanno menomato e ancor meno sostanzialmente mutato lo spirito romano; anche lo spirito di quei romani che più apertamente hanno riconosciute ed ammirate le glorie della Grecia.'

[72] Bottai 1940a, 16: 'Qui, i ruderi non solo un elemento decorativo. I monumenti della Roma pagana e cristiana, antica, medioevale e rinascimentale non sono solo opere d'arte; ma, innanzi tutto, cose vive, presenti e operanti.'

[73] Bottai 1940a, 17: 'Questo amore di Roma, che oggi tutti noi sentiamo, questo pieno, trionfante ritorno di Roma, non come ideale letterario, ma come senso e simbolo della continuità necessaria, di sangue e di spirito, nel passato e nel futuro, della nostra civiltà, lo si deve, ben lo sappiamo, al Fascismo.'

but this was precisely the case in this period. In his *Dal diario di un borghese*, the eminent art historian Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli recorded the substance of a remarkable conversation he had overheard in 1938 concerning classical art—between Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini. Bianchi Bandinelli had been chosen, because of his fluency in German and not, as he took pains to insist, because of any sympathy with the Nazi regime,[74] to act as Hitler's *cicerone* as he toured museums, archaeological sites, and other items of Italy's cultural patrimony during his official visit to Rome and Florence between 3 and 9 May.[75] Among Hitler's many observations—including his conviction that all the world's great cultures could trace their common ancestry to Atlantis—was the lack of original achievement by the ancient Romans, when their works were compared to those of the Greeks, in every artistic medium.[76] Informed that very few Roman architects are known by name, and that one could not find a counterpart to Phidias in the Rome of the Caesars, Mussolini was flustered and turned to Bianchi Bandinelli for help. Thinking quickly, the latter responded, on the Duce's behalf, 'Exactly, but the Chancellor is referring to the Greek world, in which there was the cult of personality; instead you were referring to the Roman world, where the [individual] personality was nullified in the presence of the majesty of the Empire.'[77] But, Hitler conceded, there was Vitruvius, even if he only wrote books without building anything; this led the conversation to Augustus, and from Augustus to the Pantheon. Hitler cried

[74] This segment of the Diary has been conveniently edited and published as Bianchi Bandinelli [1995]. However, in his superb biography of the diarist, Marcello Barbanera warns that we must approach these remarks carefully, because current controversies may have shaped the scholar's 'recollections' in this regard. In 1946, as he was preparing his memoirs for publication, Bianchi Bandinelli was accused by a Siena newspaper of having 'stirred up' the 'insane artistic appetites' of Hitler in 1938. While Bianchi Bandinelli vigorously defended himself against these claims, Barbanera suggests that there are reasons to doubt the diary's exact truthfulness in certain details here [Barbanera 2000, 150–152].

[75] The bulk of the state visit took place in Rome, with a side-trip to Naples (to witness a naval training exercise) and a concluding visit to Florence, from which Hitler departed to Germany on 9 May.

[76] Bianchi Bandinelli adds that Mussolini, shaking his head and muttering, 'Atlantis,' asked his opinion of the theory, while Hitler walked ahead [Bianchi Bandinelli [1995], 28–30].

[77] Bianchi Bandinelli [1995], 31: '"Esatto; ma il Signor Cancelliere si riferisce al mondo greco, nel quale c'era il culto della personalità; invece Voi vi riferivate al mondo romano, dove la personalità si annulla dinanzi alla maestà dell'Impero."'

out, '*Es war ein besonderes Studienobjekt von mir.*' And from there the dialogue continued in the same vein: not concerning military preparedness, the difficulties of alliance, British intentions in the Mediterranean, the Sudetenland, etc., but rather about the relative virtues of Greek and Roman art.

Such musings may seem comical, at several decades' distance, but the conversations were in deadly earnest. Moreover, they were direct results from the 'cultural politics' in which Bottai played such a critical role in the late 1930s and early 1940s, as Italy moved into alliance with Germany and eventually joined the War on her side. Italy's leaders were determined to impress upon the Nazis not only their 'Aryan' antecedents (as Mussolini's outburst noted above, n. 16, demonstrates) but also their descent from the 'tutors and civilizers' of all Europeans. Such efforts to promote cultural, as well as military, cooperation entered high gear after Italy declared war on Germany's side in June 1940. German-Italian study centers cropped up in both capitals, and in other cities of cultural significance in both countries, but the tensions were always there, just beneath the surface. For one example, an 'Istituto tedesco per lo studio della cultura e della Romanità' was proposed for Germany, but the German translation of the title, 'Deutsches Institut für das Studium der italienischen und nachrömischen Geschichte und Kultur', prompted a furor on the Italian end. As Andrea Hoffend has observed, in her superb study of the forms of 'Kulturaustausch' in these years, the Italians balked because they understood the thrust of the erroneous translation, which was no mere slip. It was clear to them that the Nazis believed that ancient Rome was simply an 'annex to Hellas', and thus not worth studying in its own right, as proponents of 'Romanità' continued to insist.[78] Thus, Bottai had a particular interest, especially at this point, in insisting that the Romans had encountered the Greeks at a propitious time, when the Greeks were decadent and exhausted, and the Romans, by contrast, were suffused with a new blood and a new spirit of achievement.

[78] Hoffend 1998a, 188: 'De Feo, monierte zurecht, daß "nachrömisch" wohl eine höchst inadäquate Übersetzung des Begriffs "romanità" sei, nahm es indes nicht als einen durch Unkenntnis zustandegekommenen Lapsus, sondern als Bestätigung dafür, daß im deutschen (d.h. im nationalsozialistischen) Bewußtsein das antike Rom nur mehr als Annex an Hellas betrachtet werde.' The title of her paper derives from one of Bottai's German-language publications, *Verteidigung des Humanismus* [Bottai 1942b].

With this 'new blood', Greco-Roman civilization had reached new heights, and its Empire had encircled the Mediterranean. When this civilization later encountered the Germanic tribes, moreover, a similar process began to occur, at least so Bottai claims. The Minister provided one of a series of lectures at the Lyceum of Firenze between 4 December 1940 and 28 May 1941, and these were published, under the general title *Romanità e Germanesimo*, in simultaneous German and Italian versions, in 1941.[79] Bottai's contribution, entitled 'Rapporti tra l'Italia e la Germania sul piano spirituale e politico,' attempts to explain the interest of German scholars in Roman history and civilization. Mentioning Mommsen, among others, he asks why 'Germans, more than any other people, should be so interested in *our* creations, in *our* world?' His suggestion is that, despite their differences, the Romans and Germans formed a symbiotic relationship in Late Antiquity, attaining their highest levels of sophistication in apparent rivalry with, but in essential understanding of, each other. Thus, 'the reality of Rome operated in both peoples and animated the conflicts that have arisen between them in the past.'[80]

While this may seem little more than political posturing, given the difficulties of the Nazi-Fascist alliance in these years, Bottai again returns to the theme of blood, and its potential for revivifying the fundamental Roman spirit. Through 'their natural position of antagonism and complementarity,' the two peoples actually possess a 'carica di valori essenziali alla sua coagulazione e formazione.' In the present, then, the Germans and Italians should make efforts to promote this 'fusion' again, 'in un'organica durevole fusione d'intenti e d'azione.'[81]

Again, it would be simple to overlook the political machinations that inform this seemingly innocuous antiquarian sentiment, but Hoffend draws attention to Bottai's statements at Florence, within the larger context of the 'cultural offensive' he had mounted against his German detractors in this period.[82] This 'offensive' centered on

---

[79] de Blasi 1941.

[80] Bottai 1941. Jolanda de Blasi also drew attention to Bottai's prominent role in the proceedings, and to his interest 'coltivare e cogliere i frutti fecondali dal sangue versato sui campi dell'alleanza.' Notice that, even here, blood imagery, related to its being shed on a shared battlefield, is employed in conjunction with Bottai's name.

[81] Bottai 1941, 4 and 14.

[82] Hoffend 1998b, 411.

the idea that Italy was the creator of the 'Fascismo Universale,' an 'export article' that Mussolini had shared with Hitler. As such, the Italian Fascists were re-enacting a familiar role, also played by their ancestors at the end of antiquity and at the end of the Renaissance, i.e. tutoring the 'barbarians' over the Alps in the ways of culture and refinement.[83] True to this historical memory, Bottai adapted the Renaissance 'studia humanitatis' to the title of a new study center, designed to enlighten Germans concerning Roman (and Italian) culture. This institute produced a series of publications, amazingly in the midst of wartime,[84] and these have been analyzed by Hoffend and Romke Visser.[85] However, it is important to acknowledge that, perhaps by default, Bottai had become an indefatigable proponent of 'Romanness', committed to its mission not only in Italy but throughout the world conquered by Italy and the 'new barbarians' with whom she was allied.[86] Moreover, the basis of this conception was the *biological* connection between the modern Italians and their Roman forebears (and perhaps that between the modern Nazis and their Germanic 'Vorfahren'). In sum, with his 'conversion' to Romanness in 1936, Bottai's blood, along with that of all his fellow Italians, had reawoken from its slumber and was becoming aware of its historical destiny.

[83] Hoffend (1998a) describes this fully and thoughtfully, at 181: 'Wenn Angehörige anderer Kulturen einzusehen bereit waren, daß sie ohne den zivilisatorischen Einfluß des antiken Römertums und der italienischen Renaissance möglicherweise noch als "barbari" lebten und daß der italienische Faschismus die Fortsetzung und Vervollkommnung eben dieser italienischen Blütezeiten darstellte und sie obendrein den historisch begründeten Herrschaftsanspruch Italiens im Mittelmeerraum zu akzeptieren gewillt waren, dann war in der Tat eine internationale Zusammenarbeit, ja sogar ein gewisser wirklicher "Kulturaustausch" möglich, und auf dieser Basis war Italien sogar partiell bereit, sich von den Kunst- und Kulturtraditionen anderer Völker inspirieren zu lassen.'

[84] Among its publications was *Studia Humanitatis* 1942. The book contains three papers, in German, by Bottai, Ernesto Grassi, and Salvatore Riccobono. Riccobono's, however, is printed in facing Latin translation and concerns 'Vom Schicksal des römischen Rechtes'.

[85] Hoffend 1998a and 1998b. Romke Visser has recently placed Bottai's regular and warm contacts with Germans in the early years of the War in the context of his educational reforms. See Visser 2001.

[86] Bottai's final appearance in *Roma* was an article published in Volume XX (settembre 1942), entitled, 'L'ideale romano e cristiano del lavoro in S. Benedetto' (Bottai 1942a). While the theme of this paper concerns the early medieval world, notice that Bottai has conflated 'Roman' and 'Christian', as was commonly done at the time (and in the pages of *Roma* itself, especially in 1942–1943).

The Racial Theme in Bottai's Career

While Bottai's sudden shift toward the racial theme in the period 1938–1941 has drawn much attention from his biographers and other modern historians, the role of 'Romanness' in this process has not been adequately appreciated in their evaluations. Most characterize this movement as an attempt simply to capitalize on the exigencies created by the Nazi alliance, but they rightly observe that Bottai's position in Mussolini's inner circle seems to have improved as a result.

Mussolini's own profound sensitivity when it came to matters of racial policy and the 'Aryanness' of Italians is best reflected in an article that appeared in the *Popolo d'Italia* on 26 July 1938. In response to an Englishwoman's surprise in discovering that 'the Italians are Aryans, as well,' Mussolini launched into a description of what race is, and he tied it definitively to the Roman theme. Opening with his conviction that 'Italian men and women' have nothing whatsoever to do with 'the Semitic and extra-European races,' he continued:[87]

> Coloro che vogliono vedere dei tipi ariani nella loro classica purezza e nobiltà di linee, sono pregati di esaminare gli altorilievi dell'*Ara pacis*, che nel prossimo settembre sarà esposta, ricostruita, al mondo: quei tipi rivivono attraverso cinquanta generazioni negli italiani di oggi, i quali da almeno mille anni si perpetuano fra di loro, senza assimilazioni e senza apporti stranieri attraverso le 'naturalizzazioni' così largamente applicate nei paesi dove le culle sono notevolmente inferiori alle bare.
>
> Those who wish to see something of the Aryan types in their classical purity and nobility of bloodlines are welcome to examine the bas reliefs on the Ara Pacis, which will be revealed, restored, to the world this September: these types live again, across 50 generations, in the Italians of today, the same that have perpetuated themselves at least 1000 years among them, without assimilating to and without borrowing from outsiders, in contrast to the 'naturalizations' so liberally applied in countries where the cradles are noticeably inferior to the biers.

In his recent biography of Mussolini, R.J.B. Bosworth has suggested that, at this point, 'For once, the *Duce* was not just sounding off.'[88] While the degree of anti-Semitism, as such, in Fascist policy should

87 Mussolini [1951–1978], 29, 126.
88 Bosworth 2002, 340–341.

neither be minimized nor exaggerated, he argues, there was a real transition of attitude in 1938, one directed from the very top. Concluding that this shift in thought reveals that Nazi influence had indeed trickled down into Italy, Bosworth then comments on Bottai's endorsement of it: 'characteristically,' Bottai 'tried to intellectualise the new policy.' Nevertheless, the case for the degree of anti-Semitism in the Fascist regime, throughout the period 1922–1943, is by no means closed. A sensation arose in Italy in 2004, due to the appearance of a book that traced the publication of an Italian edition of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* in 1933 directly to Mussolini.[89] In this book, Giorgio Fabre also demonstrates, with compelling documentary evidence, how the Fascists implemented a surreptitious policy of eliminating Jewish employees from state institutions, and one is reminded of the sly statement Mussolini made concerning his former mistress, in Bottai's hearing, in September 1938.[90] On the other hand, James Gregor, in his study of the intellectual pedigree of Italian Fascism, has insisted that Italian 'Fascist racism' was of a fundamentally different cast from the 'malevolent racism' practiced simultaneously in Hitler's Germany.[91] Nevertheless, he does concede that Bottai published the works of one of the most virulently anti-Semitic thinkers under the regime, Julius Evola,[92] in his journal *Critica fascista*. However, Gregor insists, this was merely 'an act of friendship' on Bottai's part, as the two had served together in the Great War.[93]

Nonetheless, the specific attempt to tie Romanness to racial theory may reflect the unique stamp of Bottai, who was suddenly more prominent in the meetings of the Grand Council of Fascism in late 1938 and throughout 1939. The measures passed by the Grand Council, and sometimes the debates concerning them, were recorded, and Bottai's name is frequently mentioned in these records, throughout these months. Introducing his educational reforms on 18 October 1938 to the Council, Bottai laid out a grand vision for the future, in which education would contribute to the 'new exigencies' of the

---

[89] Fabre 2004.

[90] Fabre [2004, 93–94] uses Mussolini's statement to begin his 14th chapter, entitled 'Prime "eliminazioni".'

[91] Gregor 2005, 185 and 194.

[92] Gillette 2002 explores the important role of Evola in the racial politics of the era in 'Chapter 7: Julius Evola and Spiritual Nordicism, 1941–1943.'

[93] Gregor 2005, 196, n. 20.

new national order.[94] He had explained some of these 'exigencies' two days previously, in a radio address designed to correspond with the beginning of the school year, explaining that 'Jews' and 'Italians' should have their own schools.[95] By February of the following year, Bottai's description of and rationale for the Carta della razza and the Carta della scuola met with 'un vivo plauso,' and by April plans were underway for the E42 exhibit, in which Bottai would play a leading role.[96] In the spring of 1939, Galassi Paluzzi lauded Bottai's success in pushing through the school reform, and he also drew attention to the 'Roman spirit' that had animated it.[97]

One may wonder whether Bottai's personal prejudices entered into this shift, but most experts on Bottai argue that his moves against Jews were based on simple power calculations. In the best biography on the subject, Alexander J. De Grand, in a subtle and thoughtful judgment, explains Bottai's endorsement of the anti-Semitic project, despite his personal lack of anti-Semitic sympathies, in this way:[98]

> Dato che Bottai non nutriva veri sentimenti antisemitici, non è facile trovare una spiegazione. Certamente il carattere decisivo del suo ministero rispetto all'interna campagna razziale avrebbe reso impossibile la permanenza al governo a chi si opponeva al razzismo. Per giunta, tutta la sua carriera fu caratterizzata da una tendenza a non spingere mai una questione di principio fino ad arrivare a una frattura completa e a dimettersi dall'incarico.

In her recent book on Fascist policies in Africa, Gabriele Schneider describes Bottai's political calculations more bluntly, noting, 'Seine Haltung wird als Servilität, aber auch als Ausdruck politischen Kalküls bewertet, und selbst wenn Bottai nicht zu den Verfechtern eines biologischen Rassismus gezählt haben dürfte, erarbeitete er die ersten

---

[94] Mussolini 1951–1978, 29, 185: 'Il Gran Consiglio del fascismo, udite le dichiarazioni del ministro Bottai intorno alla situazione degli studi medi di ogni ordine e grado, approva il suo proposito di predisporre una riforma corrispondente alle nuove esigenze culturali, sociali ed economiche della vita nazionale nel regime dei fasci e delle corporazioni; e lo incarica di presentare, in una prossima sessione, concrete proposte per un nuovo ordinamento della scuola media, da attuarsi a cominciare dall'anno scolastico 1939–'40.'

[95] Charnitzky 1994, 390.

[96] The ISR also attempted to associate itself with this Exposition. See, for example, De Andreis 1939, who begins the article with a quotation by Bottai, and concludes it with a description of 'la grande arteria' that will connect the historical center of Rome to the EUR district.

[97] Galassi Paluzzi 1939a.

[98] De Grand 1978, 195.

antisemitischen Gesetze nach De Felice zwar ohne Intransigenz, aber doch mit einigem Eifer.'[99] The reference here is likely to De Felice's description of Bottai's 'let[ting] loose in every direction' after the new policy was introduced. However, De Felice had seen Bottai's enthusiastic endorsement as an anomaly at the center of power. As he notes, 'Fortunately not everyone was as zealous as Bottai, and not everyone was ready, just to look good in the eyes of the master, to forget and trample the most elementary notions of due process and humanity.'[100]

Alternatively, Ruth Ben-Ghiat has recently insisted that Bottai had been, for many years, a 'closet' anti-Semite, and that the racial laws gave him the chance he secretly desired, to act on the prejudices he already felt. Whatever differences Bottai may have had with Farinacci concerning modern art, *both* were 'anti-Semites', and tainted by 'racism of the most virulent sort.'[101] In her estimation, Bottai had always, despite his championing of modern aesthetics, 'intended to curtail Jewish influences on the nation' (138), and the sudden turn in racial politics in the summer of 1938 afforded him the perfect opportunity to transform his latent prejudices into active policies. Fascist racism was, accordingly, not a means to an end, in Bottai's twisted view of cultural politics, but an end unto itself. The use of the bald term 'anti-Semite' is problematic in this context, and it certainly needs more ample documentation than Ben-Ghiat has provided here. The question of the degree of 'anti-Semitism' in the regime as a whole—as Mussolini's own relationship with Sarfatti demonstrates—would seem to be too complex to be simplified in this manner.

While Ben-Ghiat's argumentation concerning Bottai's personal feelings appears to be extreme, there is an interesting detail that is often overlooked when considering the Minister's role in the anti-Semitic purges of the late 1930s. G.B. Guerri, in the first comprehensive biography of Bottai, and with full access to a number of unpublished materials and drawing on a wealth of pertinent sources, alluded

---

[99] Schneider 2000, 88.

[100] De Felice [2001], 267–268. Recent analyses have questioned De Felice's rigid dichotomy of 'Fascist' and 'Antifascist' sympathies, which did not allow for shades of gray in the middle. With the passage of time, and with political changes in recent decades, such fixed categories are not considered as necessary, or as accurate, as they once were. Further, see Longo 1999.

[101] Ben-Ghiat 2001, 7 and 150.

to a rumor that was spread by some of Bottai's enemies in the summer of 1938. Given Bottai's championing of 'modern' art, the art the Nazis had deemed 'degenerate' because of, among other reasons, its connections to Jews, self-proclaimed 'defenders of the race' insinuated that Bottai was, himself, half-Jewish. A Roman journal entitled 'Tevere' pointed to Bottai's taste in art, his curly hair, and even the shape of his nose to justify their claim, and 'many Romans', at least so it was claimed, were accustomed to calling Bottai 'Peppino er giudiolo'.[102] It may be tempting to see this rumor as the key to Bottai's behavior throughout these months, in which anti-Semitism was rising so prominently to the fore of government policy, but Hoffend wisely cautions against placing too much importance on the rumor. She proffers, instead, what the diary and other materials from the period suggest, that Bottai hoped that 'racial politics' would be a means of enhancing his political position both within the Italian government and in the larger cause of the 'Fascist International'.[103]

Nevertheless, one need not blame political calculus or personal anti-Semitism alone for Bottai's shift of attitude and emphasis in this period; there was more than enough 'razzismo' inherent to the Roman theme that had been developing since the beginning of the regime, if not before. In fact, Philip Cannistraro[104] saw the anti-Semitic theme as '[a] grotesque corollary of the Roman theme,' when it appeared in force in 1938. Bottai and his peers were not merely bowing to Nazi pressure in asserting the racial 'purity' of the Italians. Rather, '. . . these racial policies reinforced the official search for the historical roots of Italian national identity. Marshalling a confusing mixture of archaeological, linguistic, and anthropological evidence, the fascist ideologues created the myth that Italians were descended from a pure "Italic" race.'

Nevertheless, Bottai took this ideology a step further, insisting that the Italians capitalize on the superiority innate in their bloodstream, by improving on the Roman example, and not merely by imitating it. It is in this light that one may examine the culmination, or better the nadir, of this sort of ideological posturing in regard to the Roman *collegia*. In 1941, a group of scholars honored the memory

---

[102] Guerri 1976, 172. Guerri merely notes that 'Molti romani allora lo chiamavano "Peppino er giudiolo" . . .', without providing a source for this particular observation.

[103] Hoffend 1998b, 407.

[104] Cannistraro 1972, 128.

of Giovanni Dettori, the first director of the Scuola di Perfezionamento in Discipline Corporative at the R. Università degli Studi di Firenze. Appropriately, most of the papers in this two-volume collection address Corporative economic theory, and celebrate the advances of these studies (and even Bottai's role in making this progress possible.)[105] However, one of the papers, by Cornelio Di Marzio, purports to explain 'La Romanità e le Professioni e le Arti', in an anti-Communist and anti-Semitic screed with only the vaguest of allusions to the historical situation of the Roman collegia. Di Marzio had (as examined above) already contributed a study on the subject to *Roma*, but he had also, on 5 September 1938, been appointed to the new 'Superior Council on Demography and Race', an organization charged with discerning racial characteristics and the proper implementation of the anti-Semitic laws.[106] It is, thus, all the more disturbing that Di Marzio now turned his attention to an institution as 'Italian' as the *collegia*, and that he simply reprinted his original piece, with only a few cosmetic changes.

In this piece, Di Marzio turns to the Roman past for examples of corporative behavior, on the grounds that, 'If we retrace the path of our history we find an intensive toil of all Italians to arrive at the reacquisition of the idea of Rome.'[107] There seem to be echoes of De Robertis and Bottai at several points in the article—he notes that, for example, 'We fascists today desire that the lamp of the greatness of Rome, relit in Mussolini's greatness, should not again be extinguished'—but the most bizarre aspect of the piece addresses the nature of 'class struggle,' which was, by common consent, unknown at Rome. Bottai had suggested that, because of Rome's reliance on slave labor, there was no class struggle for a triumphant and interventionist State to resolve and overcome. Di Marzio stands this argument on its head, insisting that the entire concept of class struggle is a Jewish fabrication, with no basis in reality: 'The Marxist class struggle is a struggle with a Jewish physiognomy and with the fundamental characteristics of pessimism and of desperation,' and to

[105] Bottai had arranged for the establishment of this, the first of the Corporative Law Schools, in 1927–1928. His connection to the Scuola is underscored in Sitta 1941, I, 445.

[106] He is listed as an 'expert in public law' in the Royal Decree that established the Council. For the document, see De Felice [2001], Appendix 24.

[107] Di Marzio 1941, I, 109–140. A stamp on the first volume's table of contents indicates that it was printed on 24 February 1941.

insist on its existence 'is not only anti-Roman and anti-Christian, but is completely anti-Italian. . . .'[108]

In essence, Di Marzio linked Romanness and Christianity to the Italian race, as such; thus, Marxist theory, being 'anti-Christian', was also 'anti-Roman' and 'anti-Italian'. The Romans were a spiritual, and not a materialistic, people, and he developed a lengthy contrast between them and the Etruscans and Carthaginians, who preferred 'commerce' to 'war'. In a none-too-subtle comment, he suggested that the Carthaginians were 'another people of Asiatic origin,' who always thought in terms of money, rather than of spirituality.[109] Building on classic anti-Semitic topoi, he exclaims, 'Therefore it arrives at the anarchic atheism of the Bolshevik abuses, and one is forced to conclude that the class struggle shares in something fatal or diabolical, that it can resemble more closely the battle between good and evil, between angels and demons, than a social and economic controversy.'[110]

This article never returns to the theme it had originally set out, having been diverted by the absence of a 'class struggle' in Rome. Nevertheless, it clearly owes something to comments that were circulating at the time, concerning the innate quality of Romanness in the Italians' blood and their natural tendencies toward corporative behavior. This 'fenomeno associativo' would, after the conclusion of the War, continue to be analyzed and assessed, and it would continue to serve the interests of totalitarian regimes. Ironically, however, these regimes would be the very ones Di Marzio most feared, the Communist dictatorships of Eastern Europe. While these 'peoples' could not, by definition, feel the 'instinctive' attraction to associational behavior, they could experience the benefits of collegial organization that their Roman counterparts had also experienced, though (naturally) only in an 'embryonic' state.

---

[108] Di Marzio 1941, I, 116–117: 'La lotta di classe marxista è una lotta con fisionomia semitica e con le caratteristiche fondamentali del pessimismo e della disperazione. . . . Volere insistere sopra una tale concezione non solo è antiromano ed anticristiano, ma è completamente antitaliano.'

[109] Another disturbing parallel may be found in some of Fritz Schachermeyr's early work on Alexander the Great and the 'Levantisierung der Oikumene' that followed in his path. See especially Bichler 2001, 354.

[110] Di Marzio 1941, I, 117: 'Si arriva così all'ateismo anarchico delle sopraffazioni bolsceviche e si è costretti a concludere che la lotta di classe è qualche cosa di fatale o di diabolico, che può rassomigliare più alla lotta tra il bene ed il male, tra gli angeli e i demoni, che ad una controversia sociale ed economica.'

CHAPTER SIX

SOCIALISM AND SOCIABILITY: THE *COLLEGIA* SINCE 1945

Bottai had included in his treatise on the Corporations two samples of the Duce's handwriting, one of which was a transcription of the second article of the 'Carta del Lavoro' of 1927. This statement had averred that, 'Work, in all its forms, intellectual, technical, and manual, is a social obligation. In this respect, and only in this respect, is it safeguarded by the State.'[1] The Constitution of the Italian Republic, which took effect on 1 January 1948, similarly placed work at the center of social life, but it inverted the language concerned, stressing the fundamental *freedom* of the worker, rather than what s/he *owes* to an omnipotent, collective state. Article One of this Constitution reads, 'Italy is a democratic Republic, founded on work. Sovereignty belongs to the people, who exercise it within the forms and limits of the Constitution.' The Fourth Article returns to the subject of work, but in more comprehensive detail: 'The Republic recognizes the right to work for all its citizens and promotes the conditions that render this right effective. Every citizen has the duty to pursue, according to his own possibilities and his own choice, an activity or a function that will contribute to the material or spiritual progress of society.'[2]

In this re-founding of the Italian nation, therefore, some of the tools of the Fascist era were refashioned and reconfigured for the post-War era. In this context, one might compare the sporting complex

---

[1] La Carta del Lavoro, Art. II: 'Il lavoro, sotto tutte le sue forme intellettuali, tecniche e manuali, è un dovere sociale. A questo titolo, e solo a questo titolo, è tutelato dallo Stato.' Version of the text cited in Schwarzenberg 1972, 103.

[2] La Costituzione della Repubblica Italiana, 'Principi fondamentali', Art. I: 'L'Italia è una Repubblica democratica, fondata sul lavoro. La sovranità appartiene al popolo, che la esercita nelle forme e nei limiti della Costituzione.'; Art. IV: 'La Repubblica riconosce a tutti i cittadini il diritto al lavoro e promuove le condizioni che rendano effettivo questo diritto. Ogni cittadino ha il dovere di svolgere, secondo le proprie possibilità e la propria scelta, un'attività o una funzione che concorra al progresso materiale o spirituale della società.' For the full text, see http://www.quirinale.it/costituzione/costituzione.htm.

dedicated by the regime in 1937, the 'Foro Mussolini',[3] which was preserved and renamed the 'Foro Italico'—with new elements added to its entry esplanade. A series of seventeen plinths had been placed alongside an arresting (and extremely bizarre)[4] series of mosaics, and these were inscribed with pivotal dates in Fascist history (though, surprisingly, not using the Fascist dating system). These blocks began with the entry of Italy into the First World War (24 May 1915), the formation of the Fascist Party (23 March 1919), and the March on Rome (28 October 1922). However, the vital moment in Fascist history, at least as depicted here, was the invasion and conquest of Ethiopia, commemorated in six monuments and culminating in the Proclamation of Empire on 9 May 1936. The boulevard was then rounded out with a series of five blank stones, evidently designed for future successes to be incorporated into the historical record. Nevertheless, rather than simply razing the stones (or even pulling up the mosaic tiles), the Republic merely continued the theme to reflect new political realities, inscribing 'The End of the Fascist Regime' (25 July 1943), the Referendum on the Republic (2 June 1946), and the inauguration of the Constitution of the Italian Republic (1 January 1948).[5]

Thus, old stones could, literally, be made to construct new edifices, and old ideas could also prove serviceable as Italy entered a new era. That the Republican Constitution began with the principle of work, and reshaped Fascist principles in its definition, is a fitting metaphor for the turn collegial studies took in the latter half of the twentieth century. In this period, and up to the present, the general tendency has been to place less emphasis on the legal and economic aspects of workers' association, and to place more on the 'social' implications of workers' behavior. Historians have attempted to examine the *collegia* as a function of wider social phenomena, arguing that they can only be understood within the complex social hierarchies of their local towns. The focus, therefore, has moved away from the

---

[3] For a comprehensive history of the site, and a series of remarkable photographs, see Caporilli and Simeoni 1990.

[4] These mosaics are in a vaguely Roman style, and most of them depict athletes participating in various sports. (It is jarring, however, to see basketball players, ice skaters, and slalom skiers in ancient Roman costume.) However, there are also contemporary images among the cartoons; one mosaic depicts a tank, airplanes, and Ethiopian natives—visual evidence of the 'empire' Mussolini was constructing.

[5] These inscriptions are described in Caporilli and Simeoni 1990, n.p.

official sanctioning or suppression of these associations, and toward the internal dynamics and desires of their membership. This tendency has, on occasion, reflected Marxist (or quasi-Marxist) readings of the past, attesting the general intellectual trends of the era, but one might be surprised at how little the strictures of Marxism have actually influenced opinion on the subject. This is all the more remarkable, as there was something of a mini-renaissance of collegial studies behind the Iron Curtain in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

However, as discussed in Chapter 3, F.M. De Robertis was, until very recently, the foremost living authority on the subject of Roman *collegia*, second only to J.P. Waltzing in influencing thought on and writing about the topic. He revisited the basic parameters of his 1938 book in two further volumes, published in 1955 and 1971, as well as in a host of articles, a number of which touch on the legal standing of the *collegia* and their role vis-à-vis the Roman state.[6] Accordingly, the essential elements of Waltzing's *Étude* continued to live well into the twentieth century, but it is also important to consider these specialized works on the *collegia* within the larger spectrum of De Robertis' publications, as well as within the intellectual rhythms of these decades. Two themes emerge from an examination of this remarkably long and luminous scholarly career. The first concerns the importance of 'public utility' in economic organization and, as a result, the state's interest in promoting the general good. The other addresses the place of the individual worker within the economy, and how he interacts with his peers and superiors, especially in a stratified society.

Like the other scholars of his generation who had survived the War, De Robertis witnessed the fall of the Fascist regime, the Nazi occupation of portions of Italy, and the gradual and protracted liberation of his country by the Resistance and Allied powers. The postwar world was, as a result, dramatically different from what had come before, but it also preserved certain necessary continuities to the past. New intellectual movements rose to the forefront, and universities—especially those that had profited from a close association with the previous regime—were buffeted by these winds in the larger society. The works of Gramsci were published and disseminated, a left-wing government took power in the aftermath of Mussolini's demise, and Marxists, perceived to have been the only real opponents

[6] Published in De Robertis 1987, Volume II.

to the regime in 'the years of consensus', began to influence the public discourse. De Robertis' books in these years reflect much of this period, as he may have felt the pressure to apply Marxist paradigms to the subject he had investigated previously—albeit in a university founded by and named after the right-wing dictator. For example, in 1945, he published a series of *Lineamenti di storia sociale romana*, composed of studies of 'The primitive social environment,' 'The life and the milieu of the lower classes and of the workers in the classical epoch,' 'The possibilities of material elevation and of social mobility,' and—most interestingly—'Manifestations of discontent in the lower classes.'[7] A synthesis of these 'elements' would suggest that the lower classes were stymied in their goal of social progress and manifested their discontent in specific terms. Nevertheless, it is also clear that De Robertis had not fully absorbed the Marxist perspectives that had attracted scholars such as Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli, who served as Direttore generale delle Antichità e Belle Arti (1945–1947), soon after his wartime 'conversion' to Gramscian Marxism.[8]

For example, the third chapter of these 'Elements' links the concepts of social mobility and financial remuneration for a worker's labor, making the reasonable case that one can only move up from the situation into which s/he was born by increasing the compensation earned in exchange for labor. In similar fashion, he argues, 'the other problem relative to the causes of the manifestations of discontent among the lower classes is connected to the same phenomenon.' In other words, if a worker is thwarted in the acquisition of a higher salary or other compensation for his labor, he is more likely to agitate for a reordering of the system that is denying his advancement. From this sense of frustration at the impossibility of social elevation would flow 'the resentment and the class struggle also of the ancient world.'[9] Nevertheless, De Robertis begins the next paragraph with an astute observation—social movements that are commonplace in the modern era cannot be documented in the sources we possess

---

[7] De Robertis 1945.

[8] Barbanera 2000.

[9] De Robertis 1945, 124–125: 'Similmente l'altro problema relativo alle cause delle manifestazioni di scontento tra le classe inferiori è connesso alla stesso fenomeno. Si intende di leggieri che i sostenitori del generale livellamento dei salarii al minimo indispensabile per la nuda esistenza non potrebbero consentire alle classi inferiori lavoratrici alcuna possibilità di elevazione . . . d'onde l'odio e la lotta di classe anche nel mondo antico.'

from antiquity. In fact, 'the class struggle and the assault on wealth' are virtually unknown quantities in the Roman Empire.[10]

He explains the absence of this struggle in terms of personal finance, i.e. there was 'a certain margin of savings' among both free workers and slaves, whose owners sometimes allowed them to keep a portion of the returns on their labor as a *peculium*, with which they might eventually buy their freedom. While the absence of full-scale slave revolt (at least after 71 BCE) is still a controversial subject in the modern literature on Roman slavery,[11] De Robertis was making a clear stand here against the absolute applicability of Marxist models to the study of the ancient economy. As he is suggesting, one should not make an argument from lack of evidence, whatever modern comparisons would suggest about a model's general relevance. He does not, on the other hand, question the class interests of those elites who composed the sources we possess.

Not unexpectedly, he was able, even in this brief overview of the ancient economy, to work in the life and social relations of the members of *collegia*. Because their documents were inscribed, and they were not subject to the dismissive and reactionary comments of the elite, these associations provide valuable—and unfiltered—insight into the perspectives of laborers on their own professional and private lives. De Robertis particularly stresses the role of banquets, common gatherings, and other moments when the *collegiati* could put aside the cares of the day, and merely celebrate their 'fratellanza'. By drawing attention to their being transformed into 'grand families' and to the 'characteristic brotherhood [that] prevailed among them,'[12] he thus diminishes the role of class struggle. They were far more interested, he claims, in sharing dinners and ceremonies than in sharing plots to dismantle the oppressive classes above them.[13] Rather, this

[10] De Robertis 1945, 125: 'Ma si tratta solo di un riflesso dei movimenti sociali propri dell'età moderna, senza alcuna base nelle fonti, dacchè, come vedremo fra poco, al mondo sociale romano è stato pressocché sconosciuta la lotta di classe e l'assalto alla ricchezza. . . .'

[11] E.g., Bradley 1994, especially Chapter 6: 'Resisting Slavery', 107–131; Shaw 2001.

[12] De Robertis 1945, 77: 'I collegi così si trasformano in grandi famiglie e molti indizi ci dicono che una vera e propria fratellanza regnava in seno ad essi.'

[13] This does not mean, of course, that they were always 'dignified' at their gatherings. De Robertis 1945, 70: 'Feriae pubbliche e private, avvenimenti particolari, riti funebri: tutto era buono per imbandire la tavola e passare qualche ora in lieta compagnia e in cordiale, se non sempre castigata, intimità.'

brotherhood made it possible for them, 'if even for only a brief time, to forget the humiliations and daily burdens' of their work.[14] In this context, De Robertis was able basically to restate what Waltzing had argued for 'la vie familiale' that the *collegia* afforded to Roman 'ouvriers'.

De Robertis' next major work, *La organizzazione e la tecnica produttiva, Le forze di lavoro e i salari nel mondo romano*,[15] published at Naples in 1946, begins with another fascinating preface, explaining, in brief terms, why this particular subject should be of interest to the reader. Claiming that it is based on 'a complex of points and observations' on the theme of labor relationships in the Roman world, he notes that economic history is, naturally, an important aspect of all Roman history. Nonetheless, he deliberately eschews the rigid, deterministic approach to ancient evidence that others might adopt, preferring to reach back in time to Tenney Frank's analysis of economic motives and their limits.[16] While using suitably Marxist language, De Robertis inverts the Marxist approach by stating, 'With this said, I do not wish to overvalue the importance of the economic factor in the development of Roman history (because I am fully in agreement with Frank's survey concerning the prevalence of extra-economic motives in the vision of its dominant classes). . . .' However, he quickly concedes, '. . . but it is certainly incontestable that the movements and the aspirations of the great masses of people (which ought, nevertheless, to act in some fashion upon the action of the leaders) inspired them, as indeed they inspire them in every time, to motives of a strictly economic nature.'[17] One may ask what stands behind this peculiar statement, one of only four short paragraphs in the preface, which is much less vivid than the one he had composed in 1938.

---

[14] De Robertis 1945, 73: 'In questo modo i lavoratori che esercitavano la stessa professione potettero aver modo di fraternizzare e di rinsaldare i vincoli di colleganza: dimentichi, sia pure per breve ora, delle umiliazioni e delle fatiche quotidiane, ...'

[15] The preface is dated 20 aprile 1946, and De Robertis is named a 'Professore nella R. Università di Bari' on the title page.

[16] As noted above, in Chapter 5, Frank's work was held in high esteem in Italy during and after the Fascist period.

[17] De Robertis 1946, 'Prefazione', n.p.: 'Con ciò non voglio supervalutare l'importanza del fattore economico nello sviluppo della storia romana (chè pienamente consento nel rilievo del Frank circa la prevalenza dei motivi extra-economici nella visione delle sue classi dominanti); ma è certo incontestabile che i movimenti e le aspirazioni delle grandi masse (che dovevano pur reagire in qualche modo sull'azione dei governanti) si ispiravano, come ben si ispirano tutt'ora, a motivi di ordine strettamente economico.'

The thrust of the argument seems to be that the world of work and workers should be studied, because economic relations were of obvious significance in the Roman Empire. However, one should not assume that people act purely from economic motives, i.e. in collusion with others of their own class and status, nor that the interests of one class necessarily collide with those of another. There is, of course, a practical element to what De Robertis is saying here—try as we might, the 'milieu' of the average Roman worker is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to assess, and we are forced to rely, in great measure, on what elite members of their society had to say about them. As such, much of this book is drawn from comments by Cicero, Sallust, the jurists, and similar members of 'the dominant classes' concerning their social inferiors and the work they performed.[18] While analyzing the 'psychology' of the higher orders, De Robertis also manages to suggest that their motives were not necessarily antithetical to those of the workers, and here he reintroduces the concept of 'public service' for the 'common good.'[19] Some functions are, he argues, too important to be left to one class or another, and they can only be performed amidst a general consensus concerning their importance. Such functions would include military duties, fire protection, postal services, and even the incarceration and execution of criminals.[20] To insist upon a conspiracy of the elite against the aspirations of the oppressed lower orders would, accordingly, neglect the real measures that elite Romans did take to insure some standard of living for those further down the ladder.[21]

With this book, De Robertis seemed to be signaling his own vision of the social classes and their proper relations, one that was still firmly rooted in the Christian Democratic message he had found in

[18] See De Robertis 1946, 64–65, for examples.

[19] De Robertis had used similar terminology in the 1930s, in an early work entitled, *La espropriazione per pubblica utilità nel diritto romano, con una addenda* [De Robertis 1936].

[20] De Robertis 1946, 81: 'Un servizio pubblico si può considerare anche quello prestato professionalmente dagli uomini d'arme, quantunque ciò abbia avuto luogo nella età imperiale avanzata. Alla stessa categoria degli esercenti in servizio pubblico appartenevano gli schiavi addetti ai servizi pubblici (familiae publicae), come quelli addetti ai servizi degli incendi, della posta, dell'accompagnamento dei magistrati, della esecuzione delle sentenze capitali, della custodia delle carceri etc.'

[21] This concern seems also to have informed his analysis, published in 1948, of the 'agricultural crisis' of Late Antiquity and its long-term consequences. See De Robertis 1948.

Waltzing and elsewhere. While Bianchi Bandinelli was applying Gramscian models to the aspirations of the lower classes, in both economic and cultural terms,[22] De Robertis remained attached to ideas that were—at least officially—promoted by the Christian Democrats (who had shrewdly planted their power on the twin poles of the Vatican and the American embassy.) Some of this context is reflected in his two later monographs on the *collegia*, which appeared in 1955 (*Il fenomeno associativo nel mondo romano, dai collegi della Repubblica alle corporazioni del Basso Impero*, Napoli: Libreria scientifica editrice) and 1971 (*Storia delle corporazioni e del regime associativo nel mondo romano*, Bari: Adriatica). Both books are essentially reconfigurations, and in a more truncated and simplified form,[23] of what De Robertis had said on the subject in 1938. However, the focus of these more stripped-down analyses is still squarely on the issues that had occupied much of the previous scholarship on the *collegia*, and Waltzing remains the standard authority referenced throughout. For example, De Robertis 1955 is organized into four overarching sections, and their titles give clear evidence for this tendency:

> Sez. I: Organizzazione e disciplina associativa
> Sez. II: Le vicende dei collegi religiosi funerarii e conviviali nell'epoca imperiale [two chapters addressing the *collegia tenuiorum*, primitive Church organizations, and De Rossi's theory concerning *collegia* and early Christian cemeteries.]
> Sez. III: I collegi professionali incaricati di un servizio pubblico
> Sez. IV: Sui limiti del regime vincolistico nel Basso Impero. Suo tramonto

As the titles might lead one to expect, the same standard conclusions appear in these studies. Rome profited from having free workingmen's associations charged with the provision of 'public services,' but, toward the end of antiquity, the State intervened decisively and disastrously in the process, reducing the workers to slaves and imposing a rigid conformity where once there had been flexible adaptation to change.

---

[22] For one example, see Bianchi Bandinelli 1970, Chapter 2: 'Two Traditions: Plebeian and Patrician'. Here, following a Gramscian analysis of culture's trending up from the bottom, Bianchi Bandinelli analyzes the survival and eventual triumph of 'mid-Italic' and 'plebeian' traditions in the 3rd century CE. [I owe this reference to Prof. Steven L. Dyson, who selected this reading for an NEH Seminar.]

[23] For example, De Robertis 1938 is nearly 500 pages long, with 130 detailed and lengthy sections, while De Robertis 1955 is roughly 250 pages and arranged in larger units.

Thus, we are not far removed from what De Robertis had maintained in the 1930s, in his review of Lo Bianco's *Storia*. When a State, whatever its ideological goals, introduces its 'chains and oppression,' the unavoidable result is 'hunger and misery to a terrifying degree.' A State will, sooner or later (and experience suggests it will be sooner rather than later), wear out the energies of its people and leave it vulnerable to attack from outside, or to collapse from within. The subtlety of De Robertis' argument, therefore, is in his demonstration that a totalitarian state, regardless of its political leanings, destroys economies, as well as the individual liberties of its citizens. The alternative vision, one of which Waltzing would certainly have approved, allies a liberal, fair-minded government with the most productive and most noble of workers, for the total benefit of the society. Again, this vision may be naive, but, given the century in which De Robertis lived, it is all the more remarkable that he continued to cling to it.

Nevertheless, it is also obvious that De Robertis, like Liebenam and Waltzing before him, believed that the subject possessed an inherent interest, simply because the experience of the *collegia* illuminates the lives of the lower classes, who are so absent in literary sources as to seem 'without history'.[24] For this reason he recognized that the 'work and workers' of the Roman world were worth studying, employing as many different sources as one could assemble to the task, despite the overwhelming class bias of most of them.[25] However, De Robertis always underscored, in his published work, that his study was mostly confined to the legal standing and government handling of the individual *collegia*. A truly comprehensive vision of the *collegia* was not what he had sought to provide—on the reasonable surmise that Waltzing had already done this so admirably (and apparently so thoroughly). Thus, in the preface to his final large compendium on the subject, the *Storia* of 1971, De Robertis observed

---

[24] In his preface to De Robertis 1955, he writes, in a wonderfully rhetorical style: 'L'argomento attinge il suo maggiore interesse dalle particolarità ambientali che ci permette di scandagliare, immettendoci—grazie particolarmente alle fonti epigrafiche per l'età del Principato e a quelle giuridiche per il Basso Impero—in un mondo che altrimenti ci sarebbe rimasto per la più gran parte sconosciuto, appiattito nel grigiore dell'anonimo e schiacciato sotto il silenzio disdegnoso delle fonti cosiddette letterarie: il mondo cioè delle classi inferiori, dei "senza storia"' (v).

[25] As another example of his attention to this subject, see De Robertis 1963, with a lengthy list of other related works, at v, n. *.

that, for the internal organization of these associations, one must still turn to 'the monumental work of Waltzing' which, 'even after the passage of so many years and the discovery of so much documentary [i.e. inscriptional] material, preserves intact its own validity.'[26] In her review of this volume, Elizabeth Deniaux drew attention to this facet of De Robertis' scholarly approach to the *collegia* vis-à-vis Waltzing's, concluding, 'The new book of F.M. de [sic] Robertis is therefore more a history of the right of association at Rome than a history of the corporations. The author, moreover, himself refers to the work of J.P. Waltzing, who uses epigraphy more than he, for a study of the internal organization of the corporations.'[27] However, when De Robertis died in September 2003, his contributions to the field were recognized as having been enormous—even if the immediate historical circumstances of his first works were rarely acknowledged. A conference was held in his honor in November 2004, celebrating 'Francesco Maria De Robertis: L'uomo, il docente, lo studioso', and one of the speakers detected four main themes in his scholarly career: 'il mondo associativo, il lavoro, il diritto penale, e la responsabilità contrattuale.'[28] Thus, it would appear that De Robertis' interest in the *fenomeno associativo* was as one element of the larger world of workers and the law. Nevertheless, it is also clear that the larger world intruded upon the work of De Robertis, at several points in his career, as well.[29]

The previous century was, of course, one crowded with various experiments in state control of social and economic factors. As detailed in the chapters above, it is clear that the Italian Fascists, throughout Mussolini's regime, found ancient corporative institutions quite useful as a means of propaganda, in their general quest for 'Roman' models. Oddly, though, this comparison appears to have been lost

[26] De Robertis 1971, VIII, n (2): 'Per quel che riguarda tuttavia la organizzazione interna delle associazioni, ci siamo in genere limitati . . . a richiamare l'opera monumentale del Waltzing . . . la quale, pur dopo tanto volgere di anni e la scoperta di tanto materiale documentario, conserva intatta la propria validità.'

[27] Deniaux 1974, 963.

[28] Quadrato 2004, an online journal at http://www.ledonline.it/rivistadirittoromano. [Very many thanks to Professor Linderski, for alerting me to this notice.]

[29] In fact, this article draws attention to the fact that Aldo Moro was, in the late 1930s and early 1940s, one of the students in, and later a member of, the Facoltà di Giurisprudenza at the Università di Bari. An influential Christian Democrat and twice Prime Minister of Italy, Moro was assassinated by the Red Brigades terrorists in 1978.

on the German Fascists of the same era. The only comprehensive study of the *collegia* in Germany in the early part of the century seems to have been Ernst Kornemann's entry 'Collegium' for the Pauly-Wissowa in 1901.[30] It would appear that he did not return to the subject in subsequent decades, nor did any younger researchers, eager to please a new corporative regime.[31] In fact, an important study of the *collegia*, by Ludwig Schnorr von Carolsfeld, was published just as Hitler was taking power in 1933, and it is still a useful analysis of the narrow problem of the 'juridical person' in Roman law.[32] Schnorr von Carolsfeld devoted his *Geschichte der juristischen Person* to the analysis of '*universitas*', '*corpus*', and '*collegium*' in legal terminology, and he envisioned it as the first in a series of four studies. While his plan was cut short by the Nazi period, his wartime service, and his incarceration as a prisoner of war,[33] he compiled a series of legal documents and inscriptions that addressed the point he wished to consider. A substantial portion of the book is devoted to explicating the legal positions of the collegial 'person', and the opening pages of the section contain a well-ordered catalog of evidence which speaks 'zur Frage der Vereinsfreiheit im römischen Recht.' However, Schnorr von Carolsfeld avoids grander statements as to the 'freedom' of workers to assemble, deferring to Waltzing at several points, and he confines his analysis to those texts that speak to the principle of a corporative 'persona' in a legal sense.[34] This monograph reflects no ideological bias, and it is an eminently well-ordered and careful analysis of a complex issue. Moreover, there seems to have been no rush to investigate the *collegia* in the Nazi era, in sharp contrast to what was happening south of the Alps. One might postulate that the Italian Fascists, having more vested in the 'corporativist' principle, were more interested in its Roman antecedents than were their German counterparts.

While the collegial phenomenon was accorded scant attention in Nazi Germany, it was of limited interest to a few historians in Eastern

---

[30] Kornemann 1901.

[31] On Kornemann, see Christ 1982, 133f, and a fuller treatment in Christ 1996, 258–261. For classicists in the Nazi period, generally, see esp. Losemann 1977.

[32] Schnorr von Carolsfeld 1933.

[33] In a foreword to the revised edition, he made a poignant observation, to the effect that: 'Die unruhigen Zeiten nach 1933, besonders auch der Kriegsdienst und die nachfolgende Kriegsgefangenschaft haben es mit sich gebracht, daß die geplanten weiteren Bände des vorliegenden Buches nicht geschrieben wurden.'

[34] Schnorr von Carolsfeld 1933, 266–267.

Europe after the Second World War. These scholars seem to have been attracted, much as some in Fascist Italy were, by the potential of the *collegium* as a foil to contemporary social conventions. Given the emphasis of both systems on State control (even if disguised as a 'dictatorship of the proletariat'), the Communists' vision of the *collegia* appears to have been similar to that of the Fascists, i.e. that the college was a suitable model for collective economic development, though regrettably frozen in an embryonic phase. The late 1960s and early 1970s witnessed another renaissance of scholarly analysis of the *collegia*, though, as in the 1930s, one might be suspicious of an agenda at work behind them. In this case, the expected line would, perhaps, have been that the collegial model failed to provide true equality among the classes. In short, the *collegia* could have been an effective tool for the ruling classes to co-opt the higher elements of the proletariat. In the process, the Roman elite would have encouraged collegial members to mimic their own behavior, and, as a result, to neglect the best interests of the oppressed classes in their society. Thus, a Marxist scheme might be applied to the inscriptional and legal evidence to yield yet another conclusion about the *collegia*: they were vehicles of oppression for the masses, but they *could* have been effective means of collective action by workers, had they been allowed to develop in the proper manner.

While there were some attempts to tack on material like this, however, the thrust of collegial studies behind the Iron Curtain was, perhaps surprisingly, virtually identical to what one would have found in front of it. For one example, the East German historian Heinz Schulz-Falkenthal was particularly struck by the communal aspect of life in the *collegia*, which seemed 'somewhat like a large family,' upon which 'each member could count for help when in a tight and difficult spot.'[35] A prisoner of war in the Soviet Union before he finished his studies in the DDR, Schulz-Falkenthal completed his Habilitationsschrift, on the 'Handwerkerkollegien' of the late Republic and early Empire, in 1969. For the next decade, he wrote a series of articles, with the general approach of tying collegial development

[35] Schulz-Falkenthal 1968, 163: 'Uns erscheint es durchaus einleuchtend, daß sodales, die sich untereinander vertraulich auch fratres nannten und in ihrem Kollegium so etwas wie eine große Familie sahen. . . . [S]o ist es doch denkbar, daß jedes Mitglied auf die Hilfe der Korporation in schwieriger und bedrängter Lage rechnen konnte.'

to the wider socio-economic history of Rome from the early Republic through Late Antiquity.[36] The titles of these papers draw attention to his apparent interest in the place of *collegia*, within the larger context of their communities. For example, in 1971, he addressed 'Gegenseitigkeitshilfe und Unterstützungstätigkeit in den römischen Handwerkergenossenschaften,' and in 1973 commented on 'Römische Handwerkerkollegien im Dienst der städtischen Gemeinschaft und ihre Begünstigung durch staatliche Privilegien.'[37] Thus, the titles of two of his contributions to the field suggest that one of the main purposes of the *collegium* was to provide 'assistance' in dire straits. Upon reading these, one is hard-pressed to detect any Marxist-Leninist reading of the situation, and Waltzing's *Étude* appears frequently in the footnotes.

In the space of two years, two further articles on Roman *collegia* appeared in the Soviet journal *Vestnik drevneĭ istorii* (= *Journal of Ancient History*), by R.Y. Lyast and M. Ye. Sergeyenko.[38] In 1970, Lyast devoted 12 pages to the subject of 'The Composition and Political Role of the Corporations Connected with the Annona Service in Ostia (Second Century AD)'.[39] The study draws on Meiggs' *Roman Ostia*, Tenney Frank, Liebenam, and (amazingly) Rostovtzeff,[40] as well as material from Volume XIV of *C. I. L.* While these would seem reliable and expected sources, the English summary of the article suggests how the subject could be tailored to sound Marxist themes.[41]

Lyast concedes that '[i]n the literature', the professional *collegia* of Ostia, especially those connected with the provision of grain for Rome, 'were the heart and centre of the political and social life of Ostia in the second century AD.' The social composition and political influence of the corporations, as well as their economic affairs, are well documented, and it is clear that their members were 'the

---

[36] For details of his career, see Willing 1991, 120, 152, and 207.

[37] Schulz-Falkenthal 1971 and 1973, with several other articles in the Bibliography.

[38] For its 1969 volume, this journal also included an article on a slightly different theme, by Kolosovskaja 1969.

[39] Lyast 1970.

[40] Lyast 1970, 150, n. 73 cites the 1957 edition of Rostovtzeff's *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (originally published in 1926).

[41] The English summary has been followed here, because the author cannot read Russian. However, I was fortunate to have the opinion of my colleague, Prof. Vladimir Solonari, who detected a change of tone, toward an awkward Marxist-Leninist analysis, in the two final paragraphs of the article. This may suggest editing by another hand, or some other attempt to appease officials?

new Ostian nobility, which consisted mainly of freedmen and provincials who had prospered in trade and handicraft production.' Inscriptions reveal that these social risers were not shy about naming as their patrons and officials many of the town's most prominent citizens, who were both its economic and its political elite. Accordingly—and it should be fairly obvious where the argument is proceeding by this point—the *collegia* membership 'was closely involved, not only with the municipal, but also with the state government and was clearly interested in maintaining the latter.' This factor led, as early as the second century, 'to the reduction of corporations by the state to a condition of bondage,' and the blame for this new slavery rests squarely on the shoulders of the freedmen and provincials whose families had gained control of the leading corporations. In other words, a group of pre-modern freedpeople had betrayed the best interests of their own class by allying themselves with their social betters, ensuring effective slavery for themselves, as well as for the actually enslaved. Notice that Lyast seems to have traced the downfall of the collegial system not to excessive state intervention, but instead to the collusion of its elite members with the dominant power structure.

Two years later, M. Ye. Sergeyenko dealt directly with the Lanuvian inscription, composing an article entitled 'From the Life of the Italian *Collegia*'.[42] However, the approach of this article is very different from Lyast's, due in great measure to the remarkable person who composed it, Maria Yefimovna Sergeyenko. Born in 1891, Sergeyenko was a student of Rostovtzeff, whom, according to a biographical account, she always claimed as her teacher, regardless of his subsequent fall from favor.[43] She rose to prominence in Leningrad, and she was later decorated by the regime for not abandoning her students during the siege. Over the course of a remarkably long career (she died in 1987 in Leningrad), Sergeyenko, like her mentor, produced a series of important books on the daily life and socio-economic conditions of the Roman Empire. One of these, *The Common People of Ancient Italy*, was published in 1964 and is apparently still

[42] Sergeyenko 1972.

[43] See her biography (in Russian) on the website of the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg, where she worked between 1931 and 1934, http://www.nlr.ru:8101/ar/staff/serg.htm. Very many thanks to Prof. Solonari for translating the document and for sharing its contents with me. On Rostovtzeff, see especially Christ 1972 and Momigliano 1966.

read in Russia.[44] In her brief piece on the Lanuvian inscription, however, Sergeyenko's main concern is to show that the letter of the law—even as codified in the inscribed regulations of this *collegium salutare*—is not a reliable indicator of the 'real life' of the *collegia*. She demonstrates, just as Cohn had a century earlier, that the *tenuiores* were 'by no means beggars', and she notes that, while the members of the *collegium* could theoretically will their savings to whomever they liked, the bulk of the membership were enslaved and freed men who could not make a will. And most importantly, she challenges Waltzing's assertion that the '*funeraticium*' was used to pay for funerals, as the evidence suggests that the amount (200 HS) was too small to cover the basic expenses. At no point does she incorporate standard Marxist-Leninist theory to suggest a conflict between the upper and lower classes within the college, and her article could, if translated into another language, have appeared virtually anywhere else at the same period. In another context, Karl Christ has drawn attention to the influence of Sergeyenko's work in the DDR, while acknowledging that it was 'in complete harmony with contemporary Western European studies.'[45]

One might conclude that it was not a simple process to translate the Roman *collegia* into Marxist-Leninist dialectic, and it is clearly the case that the most influential writers on the topic have not been dedicated to Marxist paradigms. In his review of De Robertis' *Storia delle corporazioni* (1971), Volker Weber observed that, while the book was less a general than a legal-historical work, '[f]reilich steht er nicht auf dem Boden der marxistisch-leninistischen Geschichtstheorie.'[46] Thus, 'socialism', especially of the latter-twentieth-century variety, was not a component of the collegial phenomenon, as opinion on the subject continued to evolve. However, 'sociability', the tendency of the members of *collegia* to assemble for primarily 'social' reasons, has become the dominant feature in such studies. In short, contemporary scholars have turned decisively away from the 'professional' concerns of Waltzing and the 'juridical' approach of De Robertis, and have embraced something more like Ramsay MacMullen's concept of 'social relations', as reflected in the behavior of collegial organizations.

---

[44] The book, with the Russian title *Prost'ie liudi drevneĭ Italii*, has been posted at http://ancientrome.ru/publik/sergeenko/ser02s.htm.
[45] Christ 1982, 323.
[46] Weber 1977, 248.

In 1974, MacMullen put the essentials of the situation in eloquent and sensible terms. While one might expect a united force of workers to have been able to exert pressure on their patrons and town officials, the evidence for this simply does not exist. As he observes, 'But what is striking about Roman crafts in operation is not that they pushed their interests as defined in a modern sense but that they did so only very rarely indeed.'[47] Nothing in the ancient documents suggests that *collegia* called for a strike to secure their interests—though here one might recall Waltzing's brief comment on one inscription that might be so read (see above, Chapter 2)—nor are we ever told of attempts to maintain wages, to regulate practitioners of the craft, or to lobby for better working conditions. On the other hand, MacMullen continues, these crafty organizations did manage to make their association profitable in a certain, more 'social', sense. They could 'command the patronage of really important persons', tying themselves to patrons financially and in terms of mutual obligations. An individual worker would never have been so honored by the haughty elite. United with others of his type, though, he was empowered to exchange favors with local officials—and, on rare occasions, to achieve the recognition of the Emperor and/or the Senate.

In this context, MacMullen stressed that the *collegia* seem to have pursued honor and status, rather than narrowly economic advantage. Like many other kinds of groups in their society, they recognized the power of a unified presence in the acquisition of status, for which everyone in the Roman world was, individually, so eager. Rather than pressing for paid time off and a living wage, these craftsmen were desirous of '[p]ure comradeship. Friends liked to get together of an evening to eat, drink, and be merry. Moralists grumbled that they ate too much, to the point of inflating prices in the food markets; worse, that they drank too much . . .' (77). Here, MacMullen makes a profound observation, and it is lucidly described here. The nature of the evidence we possess leads only to this conclusion—the raison d'être of the *collegium* was, through unity, primarily to obtain higher status, and not financial betterment. In the process, they were able to celebrate the joys of communing with their fellows, sharing a much-needed respite from their labors with others who could understand their cares and concerns. Nevertheless,

---

[47] MacMullen 1974, 75.

it should be noted here that the nature of the evidence is also inadequate to the task of understanding the full measure of collegial life. If, for example, a *collegium* were agitating for better working conditions, would it be likely to have inscribed a document demanding a resolution of their grievances by the power elite? And even more importantly, would they have chosen to share their most secretive deliberations with the larger society in an inscribed monument? By far the bulk of the material we have concerning *collegia* is either dedicatory (and generally in honor of a patron) or else funerary. It may simply not have been normal procedure to inscribe the detailed minutes of their sessions—especially on matters that we modern historians would most like to see addressed in their documents.

On the other hand, on those rare occasions, as at Lanuvium, when we are granted some insight into the inner workings of a functional college, the emphasis does indeed seem to have been on the social behavior and propriety of action among the members. This may indicate a concern among—at least the upper reaches of—the association to present a dignified appearance to their social betters, those whom they were most interested in joining in dignity and status. Following this reasoning, the dominant trend of contemporary collegial studies has been to explore the 'social' features of these organizations, to the exclusion of the other 'interests' that association may also have served. In this respect, the work of classicists mirrors that done by historians of similar institutions in various other historical fields. This is particularly remarkable in the case of fraternities, clubs, and other communal organizations in medieval and early modern European societies. For one example, a 1994 article in *The Journal of British Studies* tackled the subject of 'Going to the Fraternity Feast: Commensality and Social Relations in Late Medieval England.' Here, Gervase Rosser argues that scholars have overlooked the 'social aspects' of guilds and fraternities in previous analyses. In fact, he argues, this may be due to the nature of the evidence at hand, i.e. 'the communitarian emphasis in the normative records of these societies, which most late twentieth-century historians find unrealistic and, perhaps, faintly embarrassing.'[48]

By contrast, the 'Friendly Societies' of eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century Britain have profited greatly from this sort of 'social'

[48] Rosser 1994, 430.

approach. In his classic *The Making of the English Working Class* (1963, revised in 1968), E.P. Thompson paid close attention to the pivotal role played by the Friendly Societies in the socialization of this class. From the records of a group of Friendly Societies in Newcastle around 1800, Thompson detected an emphasis on 'self-discipline and community purpose', an attention to 'decency and regularity', and the imposition of fines and penalties on behavior that detracted from their larger goals.[49] One of these societies declared its motivations, in 1804, in these terms:

> We, the members of this society, taking it into our serious consideration, that man is formed a social being . . . in continual need of mutual assistance and support, and having interwoven in our constitutions those humane and sympathetic affections which we always feel at the distress of any of our fellow creatures . . . (461).

Friendly Societies generally provided funerals and other forms of mutual assistance, and they did so in an explicitly urban context. In a paper delivered in 1986, Peter Clark argued that one should not overlook the 'serious' implications of this sort of association. While eighteenth-century British voluntary associations were famous for their conviviality (often fueled by liberal supplies of alcohol), and 'while the common denominator of organized sociability was undoubtedly entertainment and fellowship, clubs fulfilled other more serious social functions.'[50] Most significant among these was the creation of a civic community, encouraging private individuals to play a public role in the developing cities of industrial England. The voluntary associations underscored the 'renewed and growing public vitality of the urban community', and they helped to make the city the purveyor and engine of new ideas and social structures (17–22).

Thus, if the example of other fields can be instructive in the case of antiquity, it would seem logical to analyze the role of the *collegia* in fostering and maintaining 'social relations', especially within the urban centers of the Roman Empire, and this has been the most common approach to the collegial phenomenon in the past two decades. This approach is, perhaps, best exemplified in Keith Hopkins' landmark *Death and Renewal*, as he dealt specifically with the Roman 'burial clubs'. True to the subtitle of his study, he explored the

[49] Thompson 1968, 457–460.
[50] Clark 1986, 15.

'sociological' factors associated with death and commemoration and attempted to explain what social, as well as practical, needs were met by resorting to an organization like this. As the population of Rome and other cities rose, he argued, surrounding land became scarce and prices soared to prohibitive levels. If the average Roman had any hope of being buried as an individual—and commemorated as such—he was forced to turn to collective entities to share the cost. Thus, despite official hostility to the process of voluntary association, in general, the burial clubs began to proliferate throughout the Empire, as a 'symptom' of socio-economic factors in an urban context. As he noted, 'The popularity of burial clubs reflected the general Roman concern for the proper care of the dead, and an anxiety that death was both unpredictable and expensive.'[51]

Nevertheless, it is also clear, from a few pieces of ancient evidence, that burial was not the only concern of this group, and that they did not exist solely to assuage 'anxiety' on this score. Attracted by 'the detailed regulations' set out in the Lanuvian inscription of the Cultors of Diana and Antinous, Hopkins extracted even more 'sociological' inferences. For example, the very detail of the by-laws, which may be somewhat 'surprising to find so low in the social scale,' implies that the membership only trusted the permanence of a formal bond. Moreover, it is obvious, judging by their rules, that these were also 'social clubs', with regular feasts, business meetings, and admonitions against drunkenness, among other stipulations. Given the preponderance of this sort of evidence, Hopkins queried, 'Perhaps commemoration of the dead was merely an excuse for a good party' (214). Thus, it is not merely enough to consider the legal, professional, or otherwise 'practical' features of their association. One must also weigh the 'social' benefits of associating with one's peers in this context. Concluding his analysis of this point with a rhetorical flourish, Hopkins observed:

> Burial clubs provided men of modest means with a decent burial. But in the city of Rome they did more than that. They saved men from the anonymity of mass graves, and guaranteed each man's individuality in death. . . . [Rome] was an embryonic mass society, which threatened to submerge men's individuality, in death as well as in life (214).

[51] Hopkins 1983, 213.

Ironically, then, it would appear that the individual Roman preserved his unique identity only by recourse to a collective organization of his peers. Only in this sense would his memory be cultivated, and, in the meantime, he could enjoy a series of rollicking good parties. Hopkins thus pointed the way to a new understanding of the associative phenomenon, as a means of attaining comfort and security in a rapidly changing world.

While Hopkins' sweeping vision of collegial sociability has not been endorsed by all subsequent scholars, it does reflect a wider trend in thinking about the subject. Frank M. Ausbüttel composed a brief overview of the *collegia* in 1982, discussing the legal and inscriptional evidence upon which our knowledge is based, while also devoting roughly half of his monograph to the social, religious, official, and political activities they performed.[52] In a 1993 study, Volker Weber placed the *collegia* against the backdrop of trade and municipal structure in the early centuries CE, demonstrating their importance to the Empire's overall economic system.[53] The following year, John R. Patterson contributed an important paper on the *collegia*, within the context of civic life, tracing their development over several centuries and highlighting their growing status and importance over that period. They boasted, and capitalized upon, their close connections with civic leaders, and their internal organization mirrored that of local leadership posts. Succinctly and compellingly put, Patterson argues that, 'As well as engaging in their normal festive and funeral activities, we thus find the *collegia* playing an increasingly important role in civic life; setting up statues to the emperors and benefactors, for example, and thus acting on behalf of the populace as a whole. . . .'[54] In another article, Patterson also drew out the restrictions placed upon our deductions by the available evidence. As he describes the situation, '. . . less emphasis has been placed on that aspect of *collegia* activities which is best attested by the epigraphic record: their more general role within the social structures of the Roman city and in particular their involvement in feasting, religious observance and burial.'[55] Thus, it would seem clear that ancient historians should

[52] Ausbüttel 1982. The third chapter, 'Aufgaben der Kollegien' (49–98) is composed of four sections, 'Kulte und Feste', 'Bestattungen und Totenkult', 'Öffentliche Aufgaben und gegenseitige Unterstützung', and 'Politische Aktivitäten'.
[53] Weber 1993.
[54] Patterson 1994, 235.
[55] Patterson 1992, 20.

evaluate *collegia* against the full backdrop of their general social situation, i.e. what goals of 'sociability' would have been realized in their meetings?

Some of the most interesting innovations in this portion of the field have come from Dutch scholars, who have offered new ways of looking at the data from a more 'social' point of view. Most prominent among these has been Onno van Nijf, who published his University of Amsterdam dissertation in 1997, under the title *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East.* In his first chapter, 'Funerary Activities of Professional Associations in the Roman East,' van Nijf challenges traditional approaches to the evidence to ask 'why did craftsmen and traders want to be buried by a collegium in the first place?'[56] Drawing on previous work and offering his own conclusions, he notes that the members of *collegia* were 'not the really destitute inhabitants of the ancient cities,' and thus financial motives alone will not suffice to explain their behavior. Nor should we turn merely to demographic factors, as Hopkins had in explaining why these people looked outside the bounds of traditional families for their last commemoration. As van Nijf notes—and in a way very similar to Waltzing—'Members of collegia expected that their families would play a part in their funeral ceremonies alongside their fellow club-members, as is shown by some of the surviving regulations of ancient collegia.'[57]

Thus, van Nijf argues, if we are to understand the funerary activities of the *collegia*, we must be prepared to see that burial by a college 'was less a necessity than a conscious choice. If we want to be able to explain why people chose to be buried by a collegium, and why they emphasised their membership of collegia at death, we must open up the discussion. In order to understand the funerary activities of collegia, we need to place them within their social and historical context' (33). In the remainder of the book, van Nijf traces out the influence of this 'social context' on the activities of the *collegia* in the Eastern provinces of the Empire. This approach is particularly fruitful in the matter of 'commensality', a feature of life of many *collegia* that underscores the 'sociable' desires and priorities of

[56] Van Nijf 1997, 32.
[57] Van Nijf 1997, 33. See also Perry 1999, Chapter 4, for further analysis of *collegia* acting in conjunction with the family members of the deceased, in joint commemorations.

these groups. Public banquets and distributions are revealing indicators of status and participation in the hierarchical structures of Eastern cities. In short, 'The evidence shows a clear social pattern behind the organisation of public food-giving and food-sharing rituals. Participation in these rituals was negotiated through membership of one or more subsections of the city, treated differently according to their standing in society.' Accordingly, rituals reinforced existing patterns of organization, and, by mimicking the 'epigraphic habits' of their social betters, the leaders of *collegia* 'internalized and reproduced' the hierarchy of their cities.[58]

In subsequent work, van Nijf has continued to employ this approach to the evidence, suggesting the means by which collegial members were incorporated into the social structures of their cities. Specifically analyzing the *collegia* of *fabri*, *centonarii*, and *dendrophori* in 1999, he examined the intersection of collegial 'sociability' and 'civic ritual', within their larger civic hierarchies.[59] Through sections on the 'Stedelijke identiteit van collegia' and their 'Feesten en rituelen', he demonstrates how these *collegia*, some of the most frequently represented in the inscriptional record, were included in civic rituals and ceremonies and thus represented the harmonious hierarchy of which they were a part.[60] Similarly, he has employed a very useful historical parallel in a Festschrift article in honor of H.W. Pleket, commenting further on the connection of private association and civic hierarchies. By comparing the Dutch civic guards (the 'schutters') of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, he concluded that membership in groups of this sort provided an outlet for self-expression and 'a focus for their sociability' for men of middle rank, who were effectively forbidden access to the higher reaches of the civic aristocracy.[61] Accordingly, 'opening up the discussion' to include the social context of the associative phenomenon had led to a more comprehensive understanding of the subject. We are dependent on what the

[58] Van Nijf 1997, 246–247.

[59] Van Nijf 1999, 199: 'Ik wil hier aandacht vragen voor aspecten van het Romeinse verenigingsleven die volgens mij ten onrechte wat op de achtergrond zijn geraakt, namelijk hun sociabiliteit en hun rol in stedelijke rituelen. Ik zal betogen dat de collegia van *fabri*, *centonarii* en van *dendrophori*, een forum waren voor economisch geslaagde en respectabele leden van de plebs.'

[60] Van Nijf 1999, 208: 'Collegia hadden blijkbaar een plaats in de stedelijke rituelen en ceremonieën die de stedelijke gemeenschap presenteerde als een harmonieuze hiërarchie van status-groepen.'

[61] Van Nijf 2002.

collegia themselves chose to say about their meetings and functions, and their strategies in terms of the acquisition and maintenance of status are probably the most significant items to be considered in this context.

Using some of this approach to the 'social' consequences of collegial assembly, Luuk de Ligt has addressed the problem of government tolerance of association in two recent articles. The general results of his work are to de-emphasize the perceived 'morbid fear of private assemblies' by the Roman authorities, and to posit that 'Roman policies towards *collegia* were far more relaxed than is usually thought.'[62] In essence, therefore, much of what J.-P. Waltzing argued over a century ago is still the standard opinion, especially concerning official licensing and oversight of the *collegia*. However, Waltzing's brief attention to 'la vie familiale' that could accrue to those who belonged to the colleges has been replaced by a throughgoing analysis of 'social relations' in and among these people.

The indications are clear that, in the future, even more attention will be paid to the role of the *collegium* as a vehicle for the acquisition and preservation of social status. Nevertheless, one might ask whether the evidence we possess at present, or even the evidence we are likely to possess in the future, will even begin to answer the questions we (like Waltzing) have about 'the social question'. Indeed, these inscriptions may actually be, despite Waltzing's claim, 'mute stones' that cannot cry out, at least in the ways we would like them to. Thus, at the end of the day, the promise of hundreds of new texts may not have been realized, in spite of 16 decades of scholarly endeavor spent in studying them. But, despite Waltzing's fears in 1912, this may also not be the disaster it seems, as the following reflection will suggest.

[62] de Ligt 2000, 252; de Ligt 2001, 358.

CONCLUSION

AUTUMN JOURNAL, BOTTAI'S JOURNAL, AND THE RELEVANCE OF ROME

The final week of September 1938 was an ideal time during which to keep a journal. On Friday, 23 September 1938, Giuseppe Bottai recorded his conversation with Mussolini, coming at the conclusion of an important day in the mission of Fascist 'Romanità'. While the Mostra Augustea della Romanità had officially closed, publications would continue to issue forth from its exhibit hall, and the Ara Pacis stood renewed, reassembled, and refashioned as a showpiece of both modern and ancient art styles. A Jewish architect, Vittorio Ballio Morpurgo, had designed the glass and concrete shell that encased this ultimate shrine to Romanness, and such collaborations, between artists and the government, would continue, at least on paper. In a few weeks, on 10 November, Mussolini would give permission to Giuseppe Terragni, whose Sarfatti Monument he could not understand, to build a 'Danteum' on the Via dell'Impero, across from the Basilica of Maxentius and Constantine. As a recent study of the proposed monument (which was never built) makes clear, it was not designed to be a celebration of Dante himself, but rather of the poet's 'allegory of the resurrection of the Roman Empire.'[1] The surviving watercolors, sketches, models, and narrative explanations from this failed project are, however, vivid testimony of the priorities of the Fascist regime and of the 'rabid Romanist', in Schumacher's phrase, who controlled it.

Reflecting these priorities, on Tuesday, 27 September, four days after the dedication of the Ara Pacis, Minister Bottai delivered an address to the Istituto di Studi Romani, the speech that might have been the seed of his treatise on the Roman and Fascist 'Corporazioni'. While his *Diario* does not record an entry for this date, Bottai continued to comment, throughout the week, on the maneuvers within the Grand Council of Fascism, with frank reflections on his fellow

[1] Schumacher 1993, 36–39.

Gerarchs and even on the Duce, himself.[2] However, another man was keeping a journal, of a sort, during this eventful week. While not at the center of any of Europe's regimes, the classics lecturer and poet Louis MacNeice also recorded his thoughts and reflections during the autumn of 1938. These musings, in the form of a 96-page poem in 24 sections, would be published the following year under the title *Autumn Journal*.[3] The work would be his masterpiece, and many modern teachers of Greco-Roman civilization are familiar with at least one of its passages, beginning:[4]

> The Glory that was Greece: put it in a syllabus, grade it
> Page by page
> To train the mind or even to point a moral
> For the present age:

But the poem is far more than a meditation on 'the trimmers at Delphi and the dummies at Sparta', et al. It is also literally a 'journal' of the thoughts of a sensitive and intelligent man regarding some of the most important events in contemporary European history. Nevertheless, it remains a 'journal' filtered through his own experiences as a teacher of the classics, in a week when the classics did not seem to matter very much at all. The week began on Friday, 23 September, with the news that Chancellor Hitler had delivered an ultimatum to Prime Minister Chamberlain, to the effect that the government of Czechoslovakia would have to agree to a military occupation of (and expulsion of all non-Germans from) the Sudetenland by 1 October. And the week would end, early in the morning of Friday, 30 September, with the signing of the Munich Agreement, one that would guarantee 'peace for our time' but would also consign the Czech people to Hitler's invasion force, as scheduled, on Saturday the 1st. Mussolini was in attendance at Munich, and he played a key role, having proposed the conference in the first place

---

[2] His entry for 23 September, after describing his conversation with Mussolini at the Ara Pacis, comments on Italo Balbo's reaction to the 'Jewish question' and notes a small joke, '*E l'altra, di Malaparte* a Mussolini: "Che fate, Curzio?" "Eccellenza, sempre pronto: ai suoi ordini e ai suoi disordini!"' (Bottai [1982], 135).

[3] Despite the lag-time between Autumn 1938 and the book's appearance in May 1939, MacNeice insisted, in a Note, that the poem was literally a 'Journal'. In his estimation, 'I was writing it from August 1938 until the New Year and have not altered any passages relating to public events in the light of what happened after the time of writing' (MacNeice 1939, 7).

[4] MacNeice 1939, 38–39.

and handing Chamberlain a 'compromise' that was essentially the same as Hitler's original demand.[5]

MacNeice understood that the crisis of the week was as much one of conscience and nerve as of great-power diplomacy. His section vii opens with:[6]

Conferences, adjournments, ultimatums,
  Flights in the air, castles in the air,
The autopsy of treaties, dynamite under the bridges,
  The end of *laissez faire*.
After the warm days the rain comes pimpling
  The paving stones with white
And with the rain the national conscience, creeping,
  Seeping through the night.

Through the long weekend of 24–25 September, MacNeice literally felt the preparations for war in his immediate London neighborhood. He notes a 'Sunday protest' in 'the sodden park', as well as the sounds of that rainy evening (30–31):

. . . Hitler yells on the wireless,
  The night is damp and still
And I hear dull blows on wood outside my window;
  They are cutting down the trees on Primrose Hill.
. . . .
They want the crest of this hill for anti-aircraft,
  The guns will take the view
And searchlights probe the heaven for bacilli
  With narrow wands of blue.

Escaping both the noise and the disquieting feelings brought on by the news, MacNeice took a train to Birmingham, at whose University he had once been Assistant Lecturer in Classics. He would stay with his friend John Waterhouse for a few nights, and the two passed the days reading over MacNeice's new poem and, according to a biographer, 'listening gloomily to the wireless.'[7] When he left London, MacNeice seems to have expected the worst. The final lines of section vii wonder whether, 'We shall have fireworks here by this day

[5] Bottai ([1982], 135–136) describes both Mussolini's departure to and arrival from Munich. In Bottai's estimation, the demonstration of enthusiasm at the train station, before he left, 'seemed to irritate' the Duce.
[6] MacNeice 1939, 30.
[7] Stallworthy 1995, 229.

week,' and the following section opens with his thoughts on his teaching career in Birmingham in former days, when 'Life was comfortable, life was fine.' As he recalled it now, in this perilous moment:[8]

Eight years back about this time
  I came to live in this hazy city
To work in a building caked with grime
  Teaching the classics to Midland students;
Virgil, Livy, the usual round,
  Principal parts and the lost digamma;
And to hear the prison-like lecture room resound
  To Homer in a Dudley accent.

Remembering that he had also had difficult moments in Birmingham, with economic crisis in the city, too little to eat, and lining one's boots with paper when they began to fail, he compares the past and present. While 'the sun shines easy' now (35),

The night grows purple, the crisis hangs
  Over the roofs like a Persian army
And all of Xenophon's parasangs
  Would take us only an inch from danger.

Nevertheless, most of the world, and MacNeice with it, could sigh with relief at the end of the week, and MacNeice returned to London on Friday, just as Chamberlain was returning from Munich. However, MacNeice was, apparently, not convinced that war had actually been averted. On Saturday, he informed a friend that he had sold his car, in the belief that there would be war by Monday, and that gas, if obtainable at all, would be severely rationed.[9] Nevertheless, by the time he wrote the end of his poem's eighth section, MacNeice recognized what had actually happened at Munich:[10]

But once again
  The crisis is put off and things look better
And we feel negotiation is not vain—
  Save my skin and damn my conscience.
And negotiation wins,
  If you can call it winning,
And here we are—just as before—safe in our skins;
  Glory to God for Munich.

---

[8] MacNeice 1939, 32–33.
[9] Stallworthy 1995, 229.
[10] MacNeice 1939, 36.

And stocks go up and wrecks
   Are salved and politicians' reputations
Go up like Jack-on-the-Beanstalk; only the Czechs
   Go down and without fighting.

The ninth section of the poem follows immediately upon this observation, and it is in these three pages of verse that MacNeice offered his famous meditation on 'the Glory that was Greece'. Having spent time in Birmingham, reminded of his former teaching assignment, and now thinking about his upcoming term at Bedford College,[11] the Greek and Roman past was clearly on his mind. However, he had also come through an unnerving week, when crisis loomed and then was averted—though with the uncomfortable knowledge that some skins had been saved, while others had been sacrificed on the altar of 'peace with honour'. After all, he muses, '*We* are safe though others have crashed the railings Over the river ravine . . . ,' and we are left merely to 'count the widening ripples where they sank.' It was in this frame of mind that the poet remembered (37):

In a week I return to work, lecturing, coaching,
   An impresario of the Ancient Greeks
Who wore the chiton and lived on fish and olives
   And talked philosophy or smut in cliques;

MacNeice then delivered his tour de force on the Greek experience, from Pindar to Alcibiades to Menander, while also thinking, 'Of the crooks, the adventurers, the opportunists, The careless athletes and the fancy boys,' etc. etc. However, when we quote these lines today, we rarely consider the immediate context in which MacNeice was writing, and what moral he was obviously drawing from these reflections. While others may try to find a 'moral for the present age' from all of this glorious history, he claims that he cannot. In short, 'These dead are dead. . . .' And this leads directly to the considerable power of the final stanza of the section (39):

And how one can imagine oneself among them
   I do not know;
It was all so unimaginably different
   And all so long ago.

[11] On the details of his appointment, see Stallworthy 1995, 224–225.

In *Death and Renewal*, Hopkins described the longing that many students of the ancient world have for their subject, in the process of encountering so many baffling customs and behaviors: 'I wondered, and still wonder what it was like to be there [Rome].'[12] But such was not, at least so I imagine, MacNeice's intention. Rather, later on in the poem, he continued his meditation on his classical training and present 'lectureship' in a chaotic and extremely dangerous world. The thirteenth section opens humorously, with:[13]

> Which things being so, as we said when we studied
> The classics,[14] I ought to be glad
> That I studied the classics at Marlborough and Merton,
> Not everyone here having had
> The privilege of learning a language
> That is incontrovertibly dead,
> And of carting a toy-box of hall-marked marmoreal phrases
> Around in his head.

Certainly, 'it was fun while it lasted', and MacNeice had done rather better than he suggests here, earning a First in both 'Greats' and 'Mods', and impressing E.R. Dodds sufficiently to be hired by him as a junior lecturer.[15] But, on the other hand, there were not, nowadays, many chances for those 'stamped as a person of intelligence and culture' to gather together, talk, and write 'definitions on invisible chalkboards In non-existent chalk.' Instead, 'Barbarians' surround us all the time, 'dozens of men in the street', all obsessed with the perennial problem 'Of getting enough to eat.' Notwithstanding this, he protests, his education was not wasted, as he had learned at Oxford never to trust what anyone says, 'and that of course is an asset In a world like ours.' In the final analysis, however, the Greeks really are dead, and with them their language, their philosophy, and their priorities in life. As MacNeice concludes this section (53):

> Good-bye now, Plato and Hegel,
> The shop is closing down;
> They don't want any philosopher-kings in England,
> There ain't no universals in this man's town.

[12] Hopkins 1983, 203.
[13] MacNeice 1939, 50.
[14] Surely an allusion to the frequent Ciceronianism 'Quae cum ita sint.'
[15] Stallworthy 1995, 141–144.

But was MacNeice correct to claim that the classics shoppes were going out of business? At precisely the same moment he was writing his 'Journal', Carlo Galassi Paluzzi was pressing a high Fascist official to gather up his thoughts on Roman history, attach suitable illustrations and bibliography, and look over the proofs of the resulting work. Moreover, he clearly envisioned a large audience for the publication, with the name of a prominent government intellectual, a modest price, and a beautifully-reproduced autograph of the Duce among its most enticing features. The world was teetering on the brink of war, and Bottai still found time to compose this, and many subsequent, treatises on Roman themes. In this respect, Fascist Italy was not, of course, alone in its time. It is, perhaps, only in the past very few years that historians have been able to look back on that period with something approximating objectivity, neither excoriating nor excusing the choices of those who lived through it. One of the most sensitive and insightful examples of this trend is Stefan Rebenich's 2001 essay on the classics in the Berlin Academy during the Nazi years. On the basis of a comprehensive table, listing the members, long-term projects, and individual products of the Akademie's members, Rebenich concluded that cooperation between the regime and the scholars was far more common than conflict. In a thoughtful and subtle judgment, Rebenich observes, 'Man begnügte sich allenthalben mit gediegener und zuverlässiger Grundlagenarbeit, feierte das humanistische Erbe Europas und beschwor die Fiktion der apolitischen *res publica litterarum* auch dann noch, als die braunen Horden schon längst jüdische Mitglieder und Mitarbeiter aus der Akademie vertrieben hatten.'[16]

This compelling image recalls to mind the character Julien Barneuve, a classical scholar who works as a censor for Vichy France in Iain Pears' 2002 novel *The Dream of Scipio*. Having come to the attention of the regime on the strength of an article on Germano-Gallic cooperation in Late Antiquity, Barneuve is invited, by an old friend, to civilize the present-day barbarians. Commenting that, 'It is a small consequence of having a classicist as Minister of Education,'[17] the Vichy collaborator urges, 'If you don't do it, someone else will. And, frankly, you have no choice. You've been sitting on your backside

[16] Rebenich 2001, 229.

[17] The reference here is to Jérôme Carcopino. On this important figure, see the recent biography by Corcy-Debray 2001.

for years talking about the need to defend civilization from the barbarians, and now's your chance. The barbarians are here.'[18]

Barneuve eventually declares his independence, in a futile act of self-sacrifice, but the reality of capitulation to the dominant regime was often more mundane, and far more depressing. In a brief piece entitled 'Classics, Ancient History and Ideological State Institutes in the Third Reich', Hans Dietz quoted various requests Himmler made of the 'Ahnenerbe', an institute he had founded and to which he appointed many classical scholars.[19] Among the pieces of information required by the Reichsführer-SS were opinions on ancient bathing customs, specifically as performed by the Homeric Greeks and the German tribes, the prehistoric connections between the Norwegians and the ancient Greeks, and the identification of SS members (and their wives) with 'Greek noses'. As Dietz observes, we do not know the answers the scholars provided, but these relationships were, in themselves, a part of the price of collaboration with the regime.

At what point, however, does 'being relevant' to one's society become 'collaboration' with it and its leadership? I think this is the central question behind the material I have addressed in this book, and I do not pretend to have the sole and definitive answer to it. The theme of 'relevance' should, nevertheless, be obvious in every chapter. Both Mommsen and De Rossi evaluated the *collegia* in terms of religion, which was a relevant quest for them both, though, of course, for very different reasons. Waltzing and the many other lesser-known scholars of his era considered the Roman *collegia* relevant, specifically in respect to contemporary economic liberalism and trade unionism. Chapter Three reveals the conundra posed to scholars attempting to remain abreast of what was still relevant in the fast-moving ideological context of 1930s Fascism. 'Romanità', and the institutions and individuals who promoted it, rendered the Roman past a relevant past, one that could inspire modern Italians to ever greater heights of achievement. Bottai found the Roman *collegia*, together with all the other Roman institutions, relevant, but only provided that the greatness 'drowsing' in the Italian bloodstream were 'reawakened', as his was in Addis Abeba. And *collegia*, in the post-War world, have seemed relevant to our contemporary desire

[18] Pears 2002, 202–205.
[19] Dietz 1985.

to understand the 'social relations' that bind people, especially those in the middle- and lower-classes.

Unlike Waltzing and Bottai, who hinted at a 'moral' that would 'leap out from' their stories, I would prefer to state mine clearly. I am convinced that classics will survive into 2050 in exactly the same way it survived into 1950, i.e. by collaborating with, or by capitulating to, the prevailing ideologies and regimes of each period. With the discipline under assault by those who wanted a more egalitarian and 'scientific' sort of education, classicists of the past accommodated their present and managed to preserve themselves, albeit at a high cost. In recent years, a few select ancient historians have been invited to confer at the White House, and a different set may be invited to some future White House again. We have learned to capitalize on all the latest filmed or televised monstrosities that deal with the ancient world, but we may be trying too hard to prove how relevant we are by doing so. MacNeice seems to have pointed out a different approach, recognizing that these dead are dead, and that their world really was 'so unimaginably different and all so long ago'. Following upon this, it might be more relevant to analyze how this 'unimaginable' past has actually affected *modern* societies, each of which labored to 'imagine' the past, but always in their own terms. As such, classicists can be truly relevant, especially to historians of the modern world, who may not appreciate all of the intellectual, visual, and historical cues that animated discussion in their chosen periods. Thus, even though our culture continues to produce ever more 'tabulae rasae', we can be useful in reconstructing some of the detail that has been rubbed off. On the other hand, we might prefer the joys and the responsibilities of being truly and completely *irrelevant*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Sources

Archivio Storico, Istituto Nazionale di Studi Romani, Roma.
Serie 'Pubblicazioni'
Busta 50, fasc. 1, 'Studi Virgiliani'
B. 160, f. 6bis 'Roma Mater'
B. 161, f. 15 'Roma Mater'
B. 161, f. 17 'Roma Mater'
B. 161, f. 20 'Roma Mater'
B. 217, f. 1 'La figura e l'opera di Augusto'
B. 248, f. 1 'Quaderni di Studi Romani'
Archivio, Museo della Civiltà Romana, Roma.
Handwritten, typed, and photographic materials related to Sale LII and LIII of the Mostra Augustea della Romanità.
Archivio (Giuseppe) Bottai, Fondazione Mondadori, Milano.
Busta 42, fasc. 14, Scritti, 'Quaderno n. 4, Diario' [section of the original manuscript, dated 4.8.1938–1.9.1939]
B.54, f. 224, Carteggio-Sarfatti, Margherita
Theodor Mommsen, Nachlaßsplitter, Briefe, Schleswig-Holsteinische Landesbibliothek, Kiel.
Various university publications, Bibliothèque de l'Université de Liège, Liège.

Printed Sources

Accame, Silvio. 1942. 'La legislazione romana intorno ai collegi nel I secolo A.C.', *Bullettino del Museo dell'impero romano*, 13, 13–48.

Acíto, Alfredo. 1924. *Corporazioni e Sindacati—nella Storia—nello Stato—nei Partiti Politici*, Milano: Iginio Trasi.

——. 1937. *La* [sic] *Corporazioni e lo Stato nella storia e nelle dottrine politiche dall'epoca di Roma all'epoca di Mussolini, Introduzione allo studio del diritto corporativo, Prefazione di Agostino Lanzillo*, Milano: Pirola.

Alföldy, Géza. 2004. 'Theodor Mommsen und die römische Epigraphik aus der Sicht hundert Jahre nach seinem Tod', *Epigraphica*, 66, 217–245.

Ambrosino, Rodolfo. 1939. 'Riferimenti all'ordinamento associativo romano', *Bullettino della Commissione archeologica comunale di Roma*, 67, 85–99.

Arangio-Ruiz, Vincenzo. 1945. *Schermaglie politiche*, Napoli: Casa editrice Humus.

Ausbüttel, Frank M. 1982. *Untersuchungen zu den Vereinen im Westen des römischen Reiches*, Frankfurter Althistorische Studien 11, Frankfurt/Main: Laßleben.

Bandelli, Gino. 1991. 'Le letture mirate', in: Cavallo, G., Fedeli, P., and Giardina, A. (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica,* Roma: Salerno, 361–397.

Bandini, Vincenzo. 1937. *Appunti sulle Corporazioni romane*, Milano: Giuffré.

Barbanera, Marcello. 2000. *Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli e il suo mondo*. Bari: Edipuglia.

Barillari, Michele. 1927. 'Per l'inaugurazione del Seminario', *Annali del Seminario Giuridico-Economico*, Anno 1927, Parte I, 1–4.

Bartoccini, Fiorella. 1997. 'Cultura e società nei "salotti" di Casa Caetani', *Archivio della Società romana di storia patria*, 100, 113–127.

Baruffa, Antonio. 1994. *Giovanni Battista de Rossi, L'archeologo esploratore delle Catacombe*, Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
Bellanca, Calogero. 2003. *Antonio Muñoz: La politica di tutela dei monumenti di Roma durante il Governatorato*, Roma: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider.
Ben-Ghiat, Ruth. 2001. *Fascist Modernities: Italy, 1922–1945*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
Benini, Rodolfo. [1982]. 'Legislazione sociale e regime corporativo nel quadro dell'economia scientifica', in: Mancini et al. 1982, I, 167–179.
Benton, Tim. 2000. 'Epigraphy and Fascism', in: Cooley, A.E. (ed.), *The Afterlife of Inscriptions*, London: ICS, 163–192.
Berger, A. 1947. 'C. C. C.: A Contribution to the Latin Terminology concerning Collegia', *Epigraphica*, 9, 44–55.
Besnier, Maurice. 1932. 'Églises chrétiennes et collèges funéraires', in: Goyau, G. (ed.), *Mélanges Albert Dufourcq*, Paris: Librairie Plon, 9–19.
Bianchi Bandinelli, Ranuccio. 1970. *Rome: The Center of Power, 500 BC to AD 200*, trans. by Peter Green, London: Braziller.
——. [1995]. *Hitler e Mussolini, 1938. Il viaggio del Führer in Italia*, Roma: Edizioni e/o.
Bichler, Reinhold. 2001. 'Alexander der Grosse und das NS-Geschichtsbild', in: Näf 2001a, 345–378.
Biró, Janos. 1969. 'Das Collegium funeraticium in Alburno maiore', in: M. Andreev et al. (eds.), *Gesellschaft und Recht im griechisch-römischen Altertum*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, II, 1–15.
Bismarck, Otto von. [1976]. *Werke in Auswahl*, ed. by A. Milatz, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
Bodel, John. 1994. *Graveyards and Groves: A Study of the Lex Lucerina* (= *American Journal of Ancient History* 13), Cambridge, MA: American Journal of Ancient History.
Boissier, Gaston. 1871. 'Études de moeurs romaines sous l'empire: Les associations ouvrières et charitables dans l'empire romain', *Revue des deux mondes*, 1 décembre, 617–650.
——. 1872. 'Étude sur quelques collèges funéraires romains', *Revue archéologique*, 23, 81–94.
——. 1884. *La religion romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins*, Paris: Hachette.
Bonfioli, Mara, and Panciera, Silvio. 1971/2. 'Della cristianità del *Collegium quod est in domo Sergiae Paullinae*', *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia*, 44, 185–201.
——. 1972/3. '"*In domo Sergiae Paullinae*": Nota aggiuntiva', *RPAA*, 45, 133–138.
Boscolo, Filippo. 2002. 'Due iscrizioni di tradizione manoscritta e il *collegium centonariorum comensium*', *Patavium*, 20, 91–105.
Bosworth, R.J.B. 2002. *Mussolini*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Bottai, Bruno. 1997. *Fascismo familiare*, Casale Monferrato: Edizioni Piemme.
Bottai, Giuseppe. 1929. 'L'esaltazione del Lavoro nell'opera di Virgilio', *Rassegna italiana*, gennaio, reprinted in Bottai 1938a, 13–43.
——. 1933. *Grundprinzipien des korporativen Aufbaus in Italien* (translation of *Fondamenti della organizzazione corporativa*), Köln: Petrarca-haus, Kommissionsverlag J.P. Bachem.
——. 1934. 'Roma nella Mostra della Rivoluzione Fascista', *Roma*, XII, 3–8.
——. 1937a. 'L'Italia d'Augusto e l'Italia d'oggi', *Roma*, XV, 37–54, reprinted in Bottai 1938a, 177–213.
——. 1937b. Hungarian translation of Bottai 1937a, *Forum*, I, 101–115.
——. 1937c. 'Roma e Fascismo', *Roma*, XV, 349–352.
——. 1938a. *Incontri*, Milano: A. Mondadori.
——. 1938b. 'Il Convegno Augusteo', *Roma*, XVI, 403–406.
——. 1939a. *Dalla Corporazione romana alla Corporazione fascista*, 'Roma Mater' V, Roma: Istituto di Studi Romani.
——. 1939b. *Die grundlegenden Ideen der italienischen Schulreform*, trans. of Bottai's works on La Carta della Scuola by Ferdinand Siebert, Wien: A. Schroll.

——. 1939c. *Roma nella scuola italiana*, Quaderni di Studi Romani I, Roma: Istituto di Studi Romani.
——. 1940a. *La funzione di Roma nella vita culturale e scientifica della nazione*, Roma: Istituto di Studi Romani.
——. 1940b. *Quaderno Affricano*, Firenze: G.C. Sansoni.
——. 1941. 'Rapporti tra l'Italia a la Germania sul piano spirituale e politico', in de Blasi 1941, 3–14.
——. 1942a. 'L'ideale romano e cristiano del lavoro in S. Benedetto', *Roma*, XX, 353–367.
——. 1942b. *Verteidigung des Humanismus. Die geistigen Grundlagen der neuen Studien in Italien, mit einer Einführung von Ernesto Grassi*, Berlin: Helmut Küpper.
——. 1942c. *Von der römischen zur faschistischen Korporation*, trans. of Bottai 1939a by Elise Pross, Ghent: Essener Verlagsanstalt.
——. 1949. *Vent'anni e un giorno (24 luglio 1943)*, Milano: Aldo Garzanti.
——. [1982]. *Diario, 1935–1944*, ed. by G.B. Guerri, Milano: Rizzoli.
Bradley, K.R. 1989. *Slavery and Rebellion in the Roman World, 140 BC–70 BC*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
——. 1994. *Slavery and Society at Rome*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Brandonisio, Vito. 1938. 'Relazione del Segretario del G.U.F. Dott. Vito Brandonisio per l'inaugurazione dell'anno accademico 1937–1938–XVI', Bari: Macrì.
Brezzi, Paolo. 1992. 'L'Istituto Nazionale di Studi Romani', in: Vian, Paolo (ed.), *Speculum Mundi: Roma centro internazionale di ricerche umanistiche*, Roma: Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri.
Briefe aus dem Elternhause Theodor Mommsens, mit dem Verzeichnis der von ihm in Kiel gehörten Vorlesungen. 1917. Unknown editor, Altenburg: Stephan Geibel & Co.
Briggs, W.W. and Calder III, W.M. (eds.) 1990. *Classical Scholarship: A Biographical Encyclopedia*, New York/London: Garland.
Buonocore, Marco. 1996. 'Giovanni Battista de Rossi e l'Istituto Archeologico Germanico di Roma (Codici Vaticani Latini 14238–14295)', *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung*, 103, 295–314.
——. 2003. *Theodor Mommsen e gli studi sul mondo antico: dalle sue lettere conservate nella Biblioteca apostolica vaticana*, Napoli: Jovene.
Cafissi, Anna. 1983. 'Contributo alla storia dei collegi romani: I *collegia funeraticia*', *Studi e ricerche (Firenze)*, 2, 89–111.
Cagnetta, Mariella. 1979. *Antichisti e impero fascista*, Bari: Laterza.
——. 1990a. *L'edera di Orazio: Aspetti politici del bimillenario oraziano*, Venosa: Edizioni Osanna.
——. 1990b. 'Gaetano De Sanctis 15 October 1870–9 April 1957,' in Briggs and Calder 1990, 43–51.
Calder III, W.M., Cancik, H., and Kytzler, B. (eds.) 1991. *Otto Jahn (1813–1868). Ein Geisteswissenschaftler zwischen Klassizismus und Historismus*, Stuttgart: Steiner.
——, and Kirstein, R. (eds.) 2003. *Aus dem Freund ein Sohn: Theodor Mommsen und Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Briefwechsel 1872–1903*, Berlin: Weidmann.
Calderini, Aristide. 1934?. 'Le associazioni professionali in Roma antica'.
Cambedda, A., and Speranza, M. Grazia Tolomeo. 1995. 'La sistemazione di piazza Augusto Imperatore', in: Cardilli, Luisa (ed.), *Gli anni del Governatorato (1926–1944): Interventi urbanistici scoperte archeologiche arredo urbano restauri*, Roma: Edizioni Kappa, 93–104.
Camera dei Deputati. 1998. *La persecuzione degli ebrei durante il fascismo: Le leggi del 1938*, Roma: Camera dei Deputati.
Canfora, Luciano. 1977. 'Classicismo e fascismo', in: *Matrici culturali del Fascismo: seminari promossi dal Consiglio regionale pugliese e dall'Ateneo barese nel trentennale della liberazione*, Bari: Università di Bari, Facoltà di lettere e filosofia, 85–111.
——. 1980. *Ideologie del classicismo*, Torino: Einaudi.
——. 1989. *Le vie del classicismo*, Bari: Laterza.

Cannistraro, Philip V. 1972. 'Mussolini's Cultural Revolution: Fascist or Nationalist?', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 7, 115–139.
—— (ed.) 1982. *Historical Dictionary of Fascist Italy*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
—— and Sullivan, Brian R. 1993. *Il Duce's Other Woman*, New York: William Morrow and Co.
Caporilli, Memmo and Simeoni, Franco. 1990. *Il Foro Italico e lo Stadio Olimpico: Immagini dalla storia*, Roma: TOMO.
Capristo, Annalisa. 2002. *L'espulsione degli ebrei dalle accademie italiane*, Torino: Silvio Zamorani.
Carcopino, Jérôme. 1939. 'Nuovi appunti statistici sulla popolazione di Roma antica', in: Istituto di Studi Romani 1939, II, 298–303.
Carli, Filippo. 1937. 'Nuovi studi sul problema della continuità storica delle corporazioni', *Archivio di studi corporativi*, 7, 327–365.
Cecchelli, Carlo. 1933. Review of G. Zoras' *Le Corporazioni bizantine*, *Roma*, XI, 88.
Cederna, Antonio. 1980. *Mussolini Urbanista*, Bari: Laterza.
Champlin, Edward. 1986. 'Miscellanea Testamentaria', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 62, 247–255.
Charnitzky, Jürgen. 1994. *Die Schulpolitik des faschistischen Regimes in Italien (1922–1943)*, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
Chiarucci, Pino. 1983. *Lanuvium*. Roma: Paleani.
Christ, Karl. 1972. 'Michael Iwanowitsch Rostovtzeff (1870–1952)', in: *Von Gibbon zu Rostovtzeff. Leben und Werk führender Althistoriker der Neuzeit*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 334–349.
——. 1982. *Römische Geschichte und deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft*, München: Beck.
——. 1996. 'Reichsgedanke und Imperium Romanum in der nationalsozialistischen Ära', in: *Von Caesar zu Konstantin*, München: Beck, 255–274.
Clark, Peter. 1986. *Sociability and Urbanity: Clubs and Societies in the Eighteenth Century City, The Eighth H.J. Hoyos Memorial Lecture, 23rd April 1986*, Leicester: Victorian Studies Centre, University of Leicester.
Clementi, F. 1930. 'I mercati traianei e la via Biberatica', *Roma*, VIII, 505–520.
Cofrancesco, Dino. 1980. 'Appunti per un'analisi del mito romano nell'ideologia fascista', *Storia contemporanea*, 11, 383–412.
Cohn, Max. 1873. *Zum römischen Vereinsrecht: Abhandlungen aus der Rechtsgeschichte*, Berlin: Weidmann.
Colini, Antonio. 1933. *Il Fascio Littorio, ricercato negli antichi monumenti*, Roma: Libreria dello Stato.
Corcy-Debray, Stéphanie. 2001. *Jérôme Carcopino, un historien à Vichy*, Paris: L'Harmattan.
Cordova, Ferdinando. 1974. *Le origini dei sindacati fascisti, 1918–1926*, Bari: Laterza.
Costamagna, Carlo. 1927. *Manuale di diritto corporativo italiano*, Torino: Unione Tip.-Ed. Torinese.
Cracco Ruggini, Lellia. 1971. 'Le associazioni professionali nel mondo romano-bizantino', in: *Artigianato e tecnica nella società dell'alto medioevo occidentale (= Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo 18)*, Spoleto: Presso la sede del Centro, I, 59–193.
——. 1973. 'Stato e associazioni professionali nell'età imperiale romana', in: *Akten des VI. Internationalen Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik*, München: Beck, 271–311.
Crifò, Giuliano. 1989. 'La storiografia giuridica italiana tra le due guerre', in: Christ, Karl and Gabba, Emilio (eds.), *Caesar und Augustus*, Como: New Press, I, 235–275.
Croke, Brian. 1990. 'Mommsen on Gibbon', *Quaderni di Storia*, 32, 47–59.
Cutelli. 1932. 'Fascio e corporazione nel nuovo stato Italiano', in: *Atti del secondo convegno di studi sindacati e corporativi*, Roma: Tipografia del Senato, II, 184–185.
Daremberg, Charles and Saglio, Edmond. 1892. *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines, d'après les textes et les monuments*, 2nd edition, Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie.

Dawson, W.H. 1890. *Bismarck and State Socialism*, London: Swan Sonnenschein.
De Andreis, Giuseppe Borrelli. 1939. 'La Roma imperiale e mussoliniana e la funzione del quartiere dell'Esposizione Universale 1942', in: Istituto di Studi Romani 1939, IV, 208–212.
De Bernardi, Alberto, and Guarracino, Scipione. 1998. *Il fascismo: Dizionario di storia, personaggi, cultura, economia, fonti e dibattito storiografico*, Milano: B. Mondadori.
de Blasi, Jolanda (ed.) 1941. *Romanità e Germanesimo*, Firenze: G.C. Sansoni.
De Felice, Renzo. 1974. *Mussolini il duce, I. Gli anni del consenso (1929–1936)*, Torino: Einaudi.
——. 1977. *Storia degli ebrei italiani sotto il fascismo*, 2nd ed., Torino: Einaudi.
——. [2001]. *The Jews in Fascist Italy*, trans. of De Felice 1977 by Robert L. Miller, New York: Enigma.
De Francisci, Pietro. 1933. 'Il diritto pubblico romano negli studi italiani del secolo XX', *Roma*, XI, 1–12.
——. 1936. 'Questioni di Metodo', in: Studi 1936, I, 3f.
——. 1959. *Primordia civitatis*, Roma: Apollinaris.
De Grand, Alexander J. 1978. *Bottai e la cultura fascista*, trans. by Pietro Negri, Bari: Laterza.
——. 1982. 'Bottai, Giuseppe', in: Cannistraro 1982, 89–91.
De Grazia, Victoria. 1981. *Consenso e cultura di massa nell'Italia fascista: l'organizzazione del dopolavoro*, Roma: Laterza.
de Ligt, Luuk. 2000. 'Governmental Attitudes towards Markets and *Collegia*', in: Lo Cascio, Elio (ed.), *Mercati permanenti e mercati periodici nel mondo romano, Atti degli Incontri capresi di storia dell'economia antica (Capri 13–15 ottobre 1997)*, Bari: Edipuglia, 237–252.
——. 2001. '*D.* 47, 22, 1, pr.-1 and the Formation of Semi-Public *Collegia*', *Latomus*, 60, 345–358.
Demandt, Alexander. 1990. 'Theodor Mommsen, 30 November 1817–1 November 1903', in: Briggs and Calder 1990, 285–309.
Deniaux, Elizabeth. 1974. Review of De Robertis 1971, *Latomus*, 33, 961–964.
De Robertis, Francesco Maria. 1932. 'Contributo alla storia delle corporazioni a Roma: La paternità della "Lex Julia de collegiis"', *Il Diritto del Lavoro*, Anno 1932, Fasc. 8, 457–459, reprinted in De Robertis 1987.
——. 1934a. 'Corporativismo romano e corporativismo fascista', *Il Diritto del Lavoro*, Anno 1934, Parte I, 226–237.
——. 1934b. 'Recensioni—G.F. [sic] Lo Bianco, *Storia dei Collegi artigiani dell'Impero . . .*', *Annali del Seminario Giuridico-Economico*, 7, 2, 195–196.
——. 1936. *La espropriazione per pubblica utilità nel diritto romano, con una addenda*, Bari: Istituto di Diritto Romano, Università di Bari, reprint, Roma: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1972.
——. 1937. 'La convalescenza delle donazioni fra coniugi nelle "orationes" di Severo e Caracalla', in: Studi 1937, II, 37–71.
——. 1938. *Il diritto associativo romano dai collegi della Repubblica alle corporazioni del Basso Impero*, Bari: Laterza.
——. 1945. *Lineamenti di storia sociale romana*, Bari: Idea, reprint, Roma: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1981.
——. 1946. *La organizzazione e la tecnica produttiva, Le forze di lavoro e i salari nel mondo romano*, Napoli: Libreria Scientifica.
——. 1948. *La produzione agricola in Italia dalla crisi del III secolo all'età dei Carolingi*, originally in: *Annali della Facoltà di Economia e Commercio dell'Università di Bari*, n.s. 8, reprint, Roma: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1972.
——. 1955. *Il fenomeno associativo nel mondo romano, dai collegi della Repubblica alle corporazioni del Basso Impero*, Napoli: Libreria Scientifica.
——. 1963. *Lavoro e lavoratori nel mondo romano*, Bari: Adriatica.

——. 1971. *Storia delle corporazioni e del regime associativo nel mondo romano*, Bari: Adriatica.
——. 1987. *Scritti varii di diritto romano (Articoli da riviste e miscellanee)*, Bari: Cacucci.
——. 1989. '"Leges cultorum" pagane e statuti confraternali cristiani: Riferibilità ad un comune modello statutario e organizzativo', *Studia et Documenta Historiae et Iuris*, 55, 28–40.
——. 1995. 'Dai *collegia cultorum* pagani alle medievali *congregationes fratrum* attraverso il superamento della discriminazione Giustinianea in *pro* dei *tenuiores*', *Studia et Documenta Historiae et Iuris*, 61, 433–445.
——. 1998. *Federico II di Svevia nel mito e nella realtà*, Bari: Editrice Tipografica.
De Rossi, Francesco Maria. 1864–1877. *La Roma sotterranea cristiana, descritta ed illustrata dal Comm. G.B. de Rossi, pubblicata per ordine della santità di N.S. Papa Pio Nono*, Roma: Cromo-litografia pontificia, reprint, Frankfurt/Main: Minerva, 1966.
——. 1865a. 'Delle nuove scoperte nel cemetero di Domitilla', *Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana*, 3, 52–53.
——. 1865b. 'Le iscrizioni trovate nei sepolcri all'aperto cielo nella villa Patrizi', *Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana*, 3, 53–54.
——. 1865c. 'Le varie e successive condizioni di legalità dei cemeteri, il vario grado di libertà dell'arte cristiana, e la legalità della medesima religione nel primo secolo, verificate dalle recenti scoperte nel cemetero di Domitilla', *Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana*, 3, 89–99.
——. 1877. 'I collegii funeraticii famigliari e privati e le loro denominazioni', in: *Commentationes philologae in honorem Theodori Mommseni, scripserunt amici*, Berlin: Weidmann, 705–711.
De Simone, S. 1935. 'Il principio corporativo', *Annali del Seminario Giuridico-Economico*, Anno 1935, parte I, 83–120.
de Visscher, Fernand. 1948. 'Le régime juridique des plus anciens cimetières chrétiens à Rome', in: *Studi in onore di Siro Solazzi*, Napoli: Jovene, 39–54.
Di Donato, Riccardo. 1995/8. 'Materiali per una biografia intellettuale di Arnaldo Momigliano', *Athenaeum*, 83, 213–244, and 86, 231–244.
Dietz, Hans. 1985. 'Classics, Ancient History and Ideological State Institutes in the Third Reich', *Quaderni di storia*, 11, 129–135.
Di Marzio, Cornelio. 1936. 'Il concetto romano nell'ordinamento delle professioni e dell'arti', *Roma*, XIV, 397–416.
——. 1941. 'La Romanità e le Professioni e le Arti', in: *Studi in memoria di Giovanni Dettori*, Firenze: Carlo Cya, I, 109–140.
Di Nardi, G. 1938. 'Gli equilibri volontaristici nella teoria economica del corporativismo', *Annali della facoltà di Giurisprudenza [già Annali del Seminario Giuridico-Economico]*, 2, 137–174.
Doutreloux, Victor-Joseph. 1887. *Les devoirs des patrons envers les ouvriers*, Liège: Demanteau.
Dubuisson, Michel. 1990. 'Waltzing, Jean-Pierre', in: *Nouvelle Biographie Nationale*, Bruxelles: Académie Royale des sciences, des lettres et des beaux-arts de Belgique, II, 389–390.
Duchesne, Louis. 1911. *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, 6th edition, Paris: Fontemoing.
Duff, P.W. 1942. Review of De Robertis 1938, *Journal of Roman Studies*, 32, 129–131.
——. 1951. 'Les lettres c c c dans l'inscription C.I.L. VI 4416', *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité*, 6, 79–81.
Dumont, Georges H. 1974. *La vie quotidienne en Belgique sous le règne de Léopold II (1865–1909)*, Paris: Hachette.
Duseigneur, Marcel. 1886. *Droit romain: Des corporations à Rome; Droit français: Des sociétés coopératives*, Thèse pour le doctorat, Lyon: Association typographique.
Dyson, Stephen L. 2004. *Eugénie Sellers Strong: Portrait of an Archaeologist*, London: Duckworth.
Eck, Werner. 1978. 'Zum neuen Fragment des sogenannten Testamentum Dasumii', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 30, 277–295.

Eisenman, Peter. 2003. *Giuseppe Terragni: transformations, decompositions, critiques*, New York: Monacelli.
Evola, Julius. [1995]. *Lo Stato (1934–1943): Tutti gli articoli di Evola apparsi su 'Lo Stato' di Costamagna*, ed. by G.F. Lami, Roma: Fondazione Julius Evola.
Fabre, Giorgio. 2004. *Il contratto, Mussolini editore di Hitler*, Bari: Dedalo.
Falasca-Zamponi, Simonetta. 1997. *Fascist Spectacle: The Aesthetics of Power in Mussolini's Italy*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
Farinacci, Roberto. 1941. *Die faschistische Revolution*, trans. by Anton Zahorsky, München: Beck.
Ferrua, P. Antonio, S.J. 1946. 'Una lettera del Kraus al De Rossi sopra il "Kulturkampf"', *Aevum*, 20, 121–130.
Figura, Luigi. 2000. *I Governi d'Italia da Cavour à oggi*, Milano: Virgilio.
Fogu, Claudio. 2001. '"To Make History": Garibaldianism and the Formation of a Fascist Historic Imaginary', in: Ascoli, A. and von Henneberg, K. (eds.), *Making and Remaking Italy: The Cultivation of National Identity around the Risorgimento*, Oxford: Berg, 203–240.
——. 2003. *The Historic Imaginary: Politics of History in Fascist Italy*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Fossati, R. 1998. 'Gruppi universitari fascisti', in: De Bernardi and Guarracino 1998, 335–336.
Fournée, Jean. 1978. *Les normands face à la peste*, Flers: Pays bas-normand.
Frangioni, Luciana. 1998. *Corporazioni e Dintorni: Saggio bibliografico sulle corporazioni e i gruppi professionali dall'età romana alla fascista (e oltre)*, Firenze: Opus Libri.
Frank, Tenney. 1927. *An Economic History of Rome*, 2nd edition, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Frascati, Simona. 1997. *La collezione epigrafica di Giovanni Battista de Rossi presso il Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana*, Città del Vaticano: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana.
Fredeburg, Charles. 1900. *Un appel au pape contre Victor-Joseph Doutreloux ci-devant Éveque de Liège*, Liège: F. Sainte.
Fremersdorf, Fritz. 1938. 'Zur Augustus-Ausstellung in Rom', *Italien-Jahrbuch*, 1, 284–293.
Galassi Paluzzi, Carlo. 1923. Untitled essay, *Roma*, I, 1–2.
——. 1927. 'Roma e Antiroma', *Roma*, V, 437–444.
——. 1932a. 'Per il rifiorire dello studio e dell'uso della lingua latina', *Roma*, X, 271–280.
——. 1932b. Report to the Institute of Roman Studies on 29 October 1932, *Roma*, X, 321–340.
——. 1937. 'Perpetuità di Roma: La Mostra Augustea della Romanità e la Mostra della Rivoluzione Fascista', *Roma*, XV, 353–355.
——. 1939a. 'Lo spirito di Roma e del Fascismo nella riforma della scuola', *Roma*, XVII, 111–122.
——. 1939b. 'La lingua di Roma nel mondo e l'opera dell'Istituto di Studi Romani', in: Rispoli 1939, 1–11.
——. 1939c. 'Per lo studio e l'uso del Latino: L'Istituto di Studi Romani a rapporto dal Duce', *Roma*, XVII, 517–521.
——. 1940a. 'Essenza Romana d'un "Quaderno Affricano"', *Roma*, XVIII, 186–191.
——. 1940b. 'Grecia e Roma', *Roma*, XVIII, 329–332.
Galfré, Monica. 2000. *Giuseppe Bottai: Un intellettuale fascista*, Firenze: Giunti Gruppo Editoriale.
Gatti, Giuseppe. 1895. 'Centonarius', in: De Ruggiero, Ettore (ed.), *Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romane*, Roma: Pasqualucci, 2, 180.
Gentile, Emilio. 1995. *La via italiana al totalitarismo: Il partito e lo Stato nel regime fascista*, Roma: Carocci.
——. 1996. *The Sacralization of Politics in Fascist Italy*, trans. of *Il culto del littorio* (1993) by K. Botsford, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gentile, Giovanni. [2002]. *Origins and Doctrines of Fascism*, ed. and trans. by A. James Gregor, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
Gérard, Albert. 1884. *Étude sur les corporations ouvrières à Rome*, Thèse, Avocat Docteur en Droit, Montbéliard: P. Hoffmann.
Ghirardo, Diane Yvonne. 1992. 'Architects, Exhibitions, and the Politics of Culture in Fascist Italy', *Journal of Architectural Education*, 45, 67–75.
Giardina, Andrea and Vauchez, André. 2000. *Il mito di Roma: Da Carlo Magno a Mussolini*, Bari: Laterza.
Giglioli, G.Q. 1931. 'Per il secondo millenario di Augusto', in: Istituto di Studi Romani 1931, I, 277–280.
——. 1937. 'La Mostra Augustea della Romanità', *Palladio*, 1, 201–203.
——. 1938a. *Catalogo: Mostra Augustea della Romanità*, Roma: C. Colombo.
——. 1938b. 'La Mostra Augustea della Romanità', *Bullettino della Commissione archeologica comunale di Roma*, 66, 55–59.
——. 1939. *Catalogo, Mostra Augustea della Romanità: Appendice bibliografica e indici*, Roma: C. Colombo.
Gillette, Aaron. 2002. *Racial Theories in Fascist Italy*, London: Routledge.
Golden, Mark. 1988. 'Did the Ancients Care When Their Children Died?', *Greece & Rome*, 35, 152–163.
Gordon, Arthur E. 1938. *The Cults of Lanuvium*, University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology 2, Berkeley: University of California Press.
——. 1964. *Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
Greenidge, A.H.J. 1896. 'Waltzing on Roman Collegia Artificum', *The Classical Review*, 10, 50–55.
Gregor, A. James. 2005. *Mussolini's Intellectuals: Fascist Social and Political Thought*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Gregorovius, Ferdinand. [1991]. *Römische Tagebücher 1852–1889*, ed. by Kruft, H.W. and Völkel, M., München: Beck.
Gregory, T. and Tartaro, A. 1987. *E42: Utopia e scenario del regime*, Venezia: Cataloghi Marsilio.
Groag, Edmund. 1904. 'Collegien und Zwangsgenossenschaften im dritten Jahrhundert', *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 2, 481–510.
Guerri, Giordano Bruno. 1976. *Giuseppe Bottai, un fascista critico: Ideologia e azione del gerarca che avrebbe voluto portare l'intelligenza nel fascismo e il fascismo alla liberalizzazione*, Milano: Feltrinelli.
Harland, Philip A. 2003. *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
Hartmann, Ludo Moritz. 1908. *Theodor Mommsen. Eine biographische Skizze*, Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes.
Hawkins, M. 1997. *Social Darwinism in European and American thought, 1860–1945: nature as model and nature as threat*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hellemans, Stef. 1990. *Strijd om de moderniteit: Sociale bewegingen en verzuiling in Europa sinds 1800*, Leuven: Universitaire Pers Leuven.
Heuß, Alfred. 1956. *Theodor Mommsen und das 19. Jahrhundert*, Kiel: Hirt, reprint, Stuttgart: Steiner, 1996.
Hirschfeld, Otto. 1884. 'Gallische Studien, Sez. III: Der Praefectus vigilum in Nemausus und die Feuerwehr in den römischen Landstädten', *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Akademie der Wissenschaften (Wien)*, 107, 239–257, reprinted in Hirschfeld, O., *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin: Weidmann, 1913, 96–111.
—— (ed.) 1905. *Reden und Aufsätze von Theodor Mommsen*, Berlin: Weidmann.
Hirschmann, V.E. 2004. 'Methodische Überlegungen zu Frauen in antiken Vereinen', in: de Ligt, L., Hemelrijk, E.A. and Singor, H.W. (eds.), *Roman Rule and Civic Life: Local and Regional Perspectives*, Amsterdam: Gieben, 401–414.
Hochschild, Adam. 1998. *King Leopold's Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Hodder, E. 1886. *The Life and Work of the 7th Earl of Shaftesbury, K.G.*, London: Cassell and Company.
Hoffend, Andrea. 1998a. '"Verteidigung des Humanismus"? Der italienische Faschismus vor der kulturellen Herausforderung durch den Nationalsozialismus', in: Petersen and Schieder 1998, 177–198.
——. 1998b. *Zwischen Kultur-Achse und Kulturkampf. Die Beziehungen zwischen 'Drittem Reich' und faschistischem Italien in den Bereichen Medien, Kunst, Wissenschaft und Rassenfragen*, Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
Hopkins, Keith. 1983. *Death and Renewal*, Sociological Studies in Roman History 2, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Horne, John and Kramer, Alan. 2001. *German Atrocities, 1914: A History of Denial*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
Hubaux, Jean. 1929. 'Jean Pierre Waltzing, 1857–1929', *Le Musée Belge*, 33, 1–21.
Huetter, Luigi. 1934. Review of Scapparo, M., *I collegi artigiani nell'epoca romana* (Tripoli, 1931), *Roma*, XII, 522.
Isnenghi, Mario. 1979. *Intellettuali militanti e intellettuali funzionari*, Torino: Einaudi.
Istituto di Studi Romani. 1931. *Atti del II Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani*, Roma: Paolo Cremonese.
——. 1935. *Atti del III Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani*, Roma: Istituto di Studi Romani.
——. 1938. *Atti del IV Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani*, Roma: Istituto di Studi Romani.
——. 1939. *Atti del V Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani*, Roma: Istituto di Studi Romani.
Japella Contardi, L. 1980. *Propaganda imperiale e protezionismo commerciale nelle iscrizioni dei collegia professionali di Roma e di Ostia da Augusto ad Aureliano*, Torino: Giappichelli.
Kajanto, Iiro. 1966. *Supernomina: A Study in Latin Epigraphy*, Comm. Hum. Litt. 40/1, Helsinki: Societas scientiarum Fennica.
Kertzer, David I. 1997. *The Kidnapping of Edgardo Mortara*, New York: Knopf.
——. 2001. *The Popes Against the Jews*, New York: Knopf.
King, Margaret. 2000. 'Commemoration of Infants on Roman Funerary Inscriptions', in: Oliver, G.J. (ed.), *The Epigraphy of Death: Studies in the History and Society of Greece and Rome*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 117–154.
Kloppenborg, John S. 2005. Review of Rébillard 2003, *The Catholic Historical Review*, 91, 511–513.
Kneissl, Peter. 1994. 'Die fabri, fabri tignuarii, fabri subaediani, centonarii und dolabrarii als Feuerwehren in den Städten Italiens und der westlichen Provinzen', in: Günther, R. and Rebenich, St. (eds.) *E fontibus haurire. Beiträge zur römischen Geschichte und zu ihren Hilfswissenschaften*, Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 133–146.
——. 1998. 'Die Berufsvereine im römischen Gallien: Eine Interpretation der epigraphischen Zeugnisse', in: Kneissl, P. and Losemann, V. (eds.), *Imperium Romanum: Studien zu Geschichte und Rezeption*, Stuttgart: Steiner, 431–449.
Kolosovskaja, J.K. 1969. 'On the Structure of Roman Society in the First Three Centuries AD: Collegia Veteranorum', *Vestnik drevneĭ istorii*, 108, 122–129.
Kornemann, Ernst. 1901. 'Collegium', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, IV, 1, 380–480.
——. 1909. 'Fabri', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, VI, 1888–1925.
Kostof, Spiro. 1973. *The Third Rome, 1870–1950*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
Kubitschek, Wilhelm. 1899. 'Centonarius', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, III, 1933–1934.
Kurth, Godefroid. 1909. *La Cité de Liège au Moyen-Age*, Liège: D. Cormaux, reprint, Bruxelles: Editions culture et civilisation, 1980.
Laage, Karl Ernst. 1999. *Theodor Storm, Biographie*, Heide: Boyens & Co.

Lafer, Renate. 2001. *Omnes collegiati, 'concurrite'!: Brandbekämpfung im Imperium Romanum*, Grazer altertumskundliche Studien 7, Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
Lalli, Mario Tedeschini. 1976. 'La propaganda araba del fascismo e l'Egitto', *Storia contemporanea*, 7, 717–749.
Lanciani, Rodolfo. 1888. *Ancient Rome in the Light of Recent Discoveries*, Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company.
Lanzillo, Agostino. 1933a. 'Antisindacalismo dei Sovieti', *La stirpe*, aprile, 193–198.
——. 1933b. *Studi di economia applicata*, Padova: Cedam.
——. [1982]. 'Economia corporativa e politica economica', in: Mancini et al. 1982, I, 211–216.
La Penna, Antonio. 1999. 'Il culto della romanità nel periodo fascista: La rivista "Roma" e l'Istituto di studi romani', *Italia contemporanea*, 217, 605–630.
——. 2001. 'La rivista *Roma* e l'Istituto di Studi Romani: Sul culto della romanità nel periodo fascista', in: Näf 2001a, 89–110.
Laqueur, T. 1983. 'Bodies, Death, and Pauper Funerals', *Representations*, 1, 109–131.
Leicht, Pier Silverio. 1930. *Lineamenti della introduzione storica al diritto corporativo*, Città del Castello: Leonardo da Vinci.
——. 1937. *Corporazioni romane e arti medievali*, Torino: Einaudi.
——. 1946/7. 'I collegi professionali romani nelle iscrizioni aquileisi', *Rendiconti, Atti della Pontificia Accademia romana di archeologia*, 22, 253–265.
Liebenam, Wilhelm Carl Adolf. 1888. *Forschungen zur Verwaltungsgeschichte des römischen Kaiserreichs*, Leipzig: Teubner, reprint Aalen: Scientia Verlag, 1970.
——. 1890. *Zur Geschichte und Organisation des römischen Vereinswesens. Drei Untersuchungen*, Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.
——. 1895. *Festschrift zum fünfzigjährigen Stiftungsfest der Burschenschaft Teutonia zu Jena*, Jena.
——. 1922. 'Fabri', in: De Ruggiero, E. (ed.) *Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romane*, Roma: Pasqualucci, 1922, III, 10f.
Linderski, Jerzy. 1969. 'Der Senat und die Vereine,' in: *Gesellschaft und Recht im Griechisch-Römischen Altertum 1 = Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft*, 52, Berlin, reprinted in *Roman Questions: Selected Papers*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1995, 165–203.
Liu, Jinyu. 2004. 'Occupation, Social Organization, and Public Service in the *Collegia Centonariorum* in the Roman Empire (First Century BC–Fourth Century AD)', unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University.
Lo Bianco, Francesco G. 1934. *Storia dei collegi artigiani dell'impero*, Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli.
——. 1939a. *Civiltà Romana: L'organizzazione dei lavoratori*, Roma: C. Colombo.
——. 1939b. 'Il Corporativismo romano confrontato con quello medioevale e moderno', in: Istituto di Studi Romani 1939, II, 293–297.
——. 1943. *La Costituzione del principato*, Roma: C. Colombo.
Longhi, G. Marchetti. 1939. 'L'*Ara Pacis* ed il *Solarium Augusti* nella fantasia medioevale', in: Istituto di Studi Romani 1939, I, 531–544.
Longo, Gisella. 2000. 'Il problema culturale nel fascismo da Giovanni Gentile a Giuseppe Bottai,' in: Aliberti, G. and Parlato, G. (eds.) *Renzo De Felice: Il lavoro dello storico tra ricerca e didattica*, Milano: Edizioni Universitarie di Lettere Economia Diritto, 101–115.
Losemann, Volker. 1977. *Nationalsozialismus und Antike: Studien zur Entwicklung des Faches Alte Geschichte 1933–1945*, Historische Perspektiven 7, Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe.
——. 2001. 'Nationalsozialismus und Antike—Bemerkungen zur Forschungsgeschichte', in Näf 2001a, 71–88.
——. 2004. 'Minio-Paluello, Lorenzo (1907–86)', in *The Dictionary of British Classicists*, Bristol: Thoemmes Continuum, 2, 652–655.
Lyast, R.E. 1970. 'O sostave i politicheskoĭ roli korporatsĭ, sviazannykh so sluzhbami annony v Ostii (II v.n.z.)', *Vestnik drevneĭ istorii*, 112, 149–161.
Mabille, Xavier. 1997. *Histoire politique de la Belgique: Facteurs et acteurs de changement*, Bruxelles: Editions du Centre de recherche et d'information socio-politiques.

Maccarrone, Michele. 1989. 'Leo XIII. und die Geschichtsschreibung', in Esch, A. and Petersen, J. (eds.) *Geschichte und Geschichtswissenschaft in der Kultur Italiens und Deutschlands, Wissenschaftliches Kolloquium zum hundertjährigen Bestehen des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom (24.–25. Mai 1988),* Tübingen: Niemeyer, 192–223.
MacMullen, Ramsay. 1974. *Roman Social Relations, 50 BC to AD 284*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
——. 1982. 'The Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire', *American Journal of Philology*, 103, 233–246.
MacNeice, Louis. 1939. *Autumn Journal*, London: Faber and Faber.
Mancini, G. 1931. 'I vigili dell'antica Roma', *Roma*, XI, 533–548.
Mancini, O., Perillo, F.D. and Zagari, E. (eds.) 1982. *Teoria economica e pensiero corporativo*, Napoli: Edizioni scientifiche italiane.
Mangoni, Luisa. 1974. *L'interventismo della cultura: Intellettuali e riviste del fascismo*, Bari: Laterza.
Mariani, Riccardo. 1987. *E42: un progetto per l''Ordine Nuovo'*, Milano: Edizioni Comunità.
Marino, Salvatore. 1940. Review of Bottai 1939a, *Il Libro italiano*, 4, 55–58.
Marquardt, Joachim. 1886. *Das Privatleben der Römer*, Leipzig: Mau, reprint, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1975.
Martin, Dale B. 1996. 'The Construction of the Ancient Family: Methodological Considerations', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 86, 40–60.
Massano, Gino. 1930a. 'I pompieri nell'antica Roma', *Capitolium*, VI, 249–260.
——. 1930b. Review of Calderini, A., *Aquileia Romana*, *Roma*, VIII, 371–372.
Mattingly, Harold. 1939. Review of Bandini 1937, *Journal of Roman Studies*, 29, 275–276.
Maué, Hermann C. 1886. *Die Vereine der fabri, centonarii und dendrophori im römischen Reich,* Frankfurt/Main: Mahlau & Waldschmidt.
McCready, W.O. 1996. '*Ekklēsia* and Voluntary Associations', in Kloppenborg, J.S. and Wilson, S.G. (eds.) *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, London: Routledge, 59–73.
Meeks, Wayne A. 1983. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
Mélanges. 1908. *Mélanges Godefroid Kurth: Recueil de mémoires relatifs à l'Histoire, à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie*, Liège: Vaillant-Carmanne.
Mennella, Giovanni and Apicella, Giuseppina. 2000. *Le corporazioni professionali nell'Italia romana: un aggiornamento al Waltzing*, Napoli: Arte tipografica.
Meyer, E.A. 1990. 'Explaining the epigraphic habit in the Roman Empire: the evidence of epitaphs', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 80, 74–96.
Millon, Henry. 1965. 'The Role of History of Architecture in Fascist Italy', *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 24, 53–59.
Minio-Paluello, Lorenzo. 1946. *Education in Fascist Italy*, Oxford: Clarendon.
Momigliano, Arnaldo. 1935. 'I regni indigeni dell'Africa Romana', in: Istituto di Studi Romani, *Africa Romana*, Milano: Editore Ulrico Hoepli, 83–103.
——. 1955. 'Gli studi italiani di storia greca e romana dal 1895 al 1939', originally published in 1950 and reprinted in Momigliano, A., *Contributo alla storia degli studi classici*, Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 277–297.
——. 1966. 'M.I. Rostovtzeff', in: *Studies in Historiography*, New York: Harper & Row, 91–104.
——. [1994]. 'Reconsidering B. Croce (1866–1952)', as reprinted in Bowersock, G.W. and Cornell, T.J. (eds.), *A.D. Momigliano: Studies on Modern Scholarship*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 80–96.
Mommsen, Theodor. 1843. *De collegiis et sodaliciis Romanorum, accedit inscriptio lanuvina*, Kiel: Schwers'sche Buchhandlung.
——. 1850. 'Römische Urkunden', originally printed in *Zeitschrift für geschichtliche Rechtswissenschaft*, 15, 287–371, reprinted in the *Gesammelte Schriften*, Berlin: Weidmann, 1907, III, 75–124.

——. 1871a. 'Die Katakomben Roms: Vortrag, gehalten im Berliner Unionsverein, 13. Januar 1871', reprinted in: Hirschfeld 1905, 294–315.

——. 1871b. 'The Roman Catacombs', *The Contemporary Review*, 17, 161–175.

——. 1894. 'Giambattista [sic] de Rossi', *Die Nation* 12, 2 (13. Oktober 1894), 19–20, reprinted in: Hirschfeld 1905, 462–467.

——. 1898. *Liber pontificalis* [*Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Gestorum Pontificum Romanorum pars 1: Liber Pontificalis*], Berlin: Weidmann.

——. [1976]. Walser, G. and Walser, B. (eds.) *Tagebuch der französisch-italienischen Reise, 1844–1845*, Frankfurt/Main: Herbert Lang.

Mommsen, Th. and Krueger, Paul (eds.) [1985]. *The Digest of Justinian*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Mommsen, Th., Storm, Theodor, and Mommsen, Tycho. 1843. *Liederbuch dreier Freunde*, Kiel: Schwers'sche Buchhandlung, reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1968.

Monteleone, Franco. 1976. *La radio italiana nel periodo fascista, Studio e documenti: 1922–1945*, Venezia: Marsilio.

Monti, Gennaro Maria. 1927. *Le Confraternite Medievali dell'Alta e Media Italia*, Venezia: 'La Nuova Italia'.

——. 1934. *Le corporazioni nell'evo antico e nell'alto medio evo: Lineamenti e ricerche*, Bari: Laterza.

——. 1936. 'I "collegia tenuiorum" e la condizione giuridica della proprietà ecclesiastica nei primi tre secoli del cristianesimo', in *Studi* 1936, 3, 71–95.

Mor, C.G. 1956. 'Pier Silverio Leicht', *Rivista di Storia del Diritto Italiano*, 29, 5–24.

Morra, Ottorino. 1938. 'L'Istituto di Studi Romani', in: *Accademie e istituti di cultura: Cenni storici*, Roma: Fratelli Palombi, I, 617–635.

——. 1972. Untitled, *Studi Romani*, 20, 469–476.

Moschetti, Guiscardo. 1956. 'Pier Silverio Leicht', *Studi Romani*, 4, 194–195.

Mulè, F.P. 1933. 'La Mostra della Rivoluzione', *Capitolium*, IX, 1–8.

Müller, A. 1905. 'Sterbekassen und Vereine mit Begräbnisfürsorge in der römischen Kaiserzeit', *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur und für Pädagogik*, 15, 183–201.

Müller, Carl Werner. 1990. 'Otto Jahn', in Briggs and Calder 1990, 227–238.

——. 1991. *Otto Jahn. Mit einem Verzeichnis seiner Schriften*, Stuttgart: Teubner.

Mussolini, Benito. 1935. *Four Speeches on the Corporate State*, translator unnamed, Roma: 'Laboremus'.

——. [1951–1978]. *Opera Omnia*, ed. by E. and D. Susmel, 43 volumes, Volume XXIX: 'Dal viaggio in Germania all'intervento dell'Italia nella Seconda Guerra Mondiale (1 ottobre 1937–10 giugno 1940), Firenze: La Fenice.

Näf, Beat (ed.) 2001a. *Antike und Altertumswissenschaft in der Zeit von Faschismus und Nationalsozialismus*, Mandelbachtal/Cambridge: edition cicero.

——. 2001b. 'Einleitung' and 'Zu den Forschungen über Antike und Altertumswissenschaften in der Zeit von Faschismus und Nationalsozialismus', in: Näf 2001a, 9–70.

Newman, J. 1967. 'Rerum Novarum', in *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd edition, produced by the Catholic University of America, New York: McGraw-Hill, 12, 136–137.

Nicolini, Renato (ed.). 1983. *Dalla mostra al museo: Dalla Mostra archeologica del 1911 al Museo della civiltà romana*, Venezia: Marsilio editori.

Nock, A.D. 1924. 'The Historical Importance of Cult-Associations', *The Classical Review*, 38, 105–109.

Noll, Rudolf. 1983. 'La collezione Aquileiese di Vienna', in: *I Musei di Aquileia*, Udine: Centro di antichità altoadriatiche.

Olivieri, Giacomo. 1930. 'La nuova stazione dei vigili del fuoco', *Capitolium*, VI, 19–29.

Oxford Latin Dictionary. 1982. Glare, P.G.W. (ed.), combined edition, Oxford: Clarendon, s.v. 'centōnārius', 299.

Painter, Jr., Borden W. 2005. *Mussolini's Rome: Rebuilding the Eternal City*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pallottino, Massimo. 1937a. 'La Mostra Augustea della Romanità', *Capitolium*, 13, 519–528.

——. 1937b. 'La preparazione della Mostra Augustea della Romanità', *Roma*, XV, 254.

Panicali, Anna. 1978. *Bottai: Il fascismo come rivoluzione del capitale*, Bologna: Nuova Casa editrice L. Cappelli.

Papa, Antonio. 1978. *Storia politica della radio in Italia*, Napoli: Guida.

Patterson, John R. 1992. 'Patronage, *collegia* and burial in Imperial Rome', in Bassett, Steven (ed.) *Death in Towns: Urban Responses to the Dying and the Dead, 100–1600*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 15–27.

——. 1994. 'The *collegia* and the transformation of the towns of Italy in the second century AD', in: *L'Italie d'Auguste à Dioclétien, Actes du colloque international organisé par l'École française de Rome . . . (Rome, 25–28 mars 1992)*, Roma: École française de Rome, 227–238.

Pauley, Bruce F. 1997. *Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini: Totalitarianism in the Twentieth Century*, Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson.

Pears, Iain. 2002. *The Dream of Scipio*, New York: Riverhead.

Perry, Jonathan S. 1994. 'The Provincial *Centonarii* of the Early Roman Empire: Mat Producers or Firefighters?', unpublished M.A. thesis, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill.

——. 1999. 'A Death in the *Familia*: The Funerary Colleges of the Roman Empire', unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill.

——. 2002. '*CIL* 6.16932: The Creation of a Detached Signum?', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 138, 245–248.

——. 2003. Review of Näf 2001a, *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 9, 661–665.

Petersen, Jens. 1983. 'Mussolini: Wirklichkeit und Mythos eines Diktators', in Bohrer, Karl Heinz (ed.), *Mythos und Moderne: Begriff und Bild einer Rekonstruktion*, Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 242–260.

—— and Schieder, Wolfgang (eds.) 1998. *Faschismus und Gesellschaft in Italien: Staat-Wirtschaft-Kultur*, Köln: SH-Verlag.

Picard, Charles. 1938. 'L'exposition du Bimillénaire de la naissance d'Auguste', *Revue archéologique,* N.S. 5, 335–337.

Pino-Branca, Alfredo. 1930. *La Funzione sociale delle Corporazioni nella storia*, Padova: Cedam.

Podak, Klaus. 1984. 'Pfarrhaus und Philosophie oder der Untergang des Absoluten', in Greiffenhagen, Martin (ed.), *Das evangelische Pfarrhaus. Eine Kultur- und Sozialgeschichte*, Stuttgart: Kreuz Verlag, 311–327.

Pöhlmann, Robert von. 1884. *Die Übervölkerung der antiken Großstädte im Zusammenhange mit der Gesammtentwicklung städtischer Civilisation*, Leipzig: S. Hirzel, reprint, Leipzig: Zentral-Antiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1967.

Polverini, Leandro (ed.) 2002. *Aspetti della storiografia di Ettore Pais*, Napoli: Edizioni scientifiche italiane.

Preiß, Achim. 1991. 'Die Grab- und Denkmalbauten Terragnis: Die Bedeutung des Monuments für die Entwicklung der Architektur im 20. Jahrhundert', in Germer, S. and Preiß, A. (eds.), *Giuseppe Terragni: 1904–43; Moderne und Faschismus in Italien*, München: K'linkhardt und Biermann, 125–150.

Preti, Luigi. 1968. *Impero fascista, africani ed ebrei*, Milano: U. Mursia.

Quadrato, Elvira. 2004. 'Francesco Maria De Robertis: appunti di un incontro di studio', *Rivista di diritto romano,* 4, online journal, at http://www.ledonline.it/rivista-dirittoromano.

Quartermaine, Luisa. 1995. '"Slouching towards Rome": Mussolini's imperial vision', in: Cornell, T. and Lomas, K. (eds.), *Urban Society in Roman Italy*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 203–215.

Radin, Max. 1910. *The Legislation of the Greeks and Romans on Corporations*, published Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University.

——. 1929. *The Life of the People in Biblical Times,* Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America.

——. 1931. *The Lawful Pursuit of Gain*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

——. 1936. 'Imperium', in: Studi 1936, 2, 21–44.

Raggi, Oreste. 1879. 'Civita Lavinia', in *I Colli Albani e Tusculani*, Roma: U.T.E.T., reprint, Roma: Puccinelli, 1984.

Ratti, Nicola. 1825. 'Dissertazione sopra una antica iscrizione rinvenuta nel territorio di Cività-Lavinia, spettante alla città di Laurento', *Dissertazioni della pontificia accademia romana di archeologia,* 2, 437–462.

Rebenich, Stefan. 1993. 'Theodor Mommsen und das Verhältnis von Alter Geschichte und Patristik', in: Fontaine, J., Herzog, R., and Pollmann, K. (eds.), *Patristique et Antiquité tardive en Allemagne et en France de 1870 à 1930: Influences et échanges*, Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 131–154.

——. 1995. 'Giovanni Battista de Rossi und Theodor Mommsen', in: Stupperich, Reinhard (ed.), *Lebendige Antike: Rezeptionen der Antike in Politik, Kunst und Wissenschaft der Neuzeit*, Mannheim: Palatium Verlag, 173–186.

——. 2001. 'Zwischen Anpassung und Widerstand? Die Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften von 1933 bis 1945', in: Näf 2001a, 203–244.

——. 2002. *Theodor Mommsen: eine Biographie,* München: Beck.

Rebillard, Éric. 2003. *Religion et Sépulture: L'Église, les vivants et les morts dans l'Antiquité tardive*, Paris: Éditions de l'École des hautes études en sciences sociales.

Rezsohazy, Rudolf. 1958. *Origines et formation du catholicisme social en Belgique, 1842–1909,* Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, Bureaux du Recueil.

Ridley, Ronald T. 1986. 'Augusti Manes volitant per auras: the archaeology of Rome under the Fascists', *Xenia*, 11, 19–46.

Rispoli, Guido (ed.) 1939. *Per lo studio e l'uso del Latino: Bollettino internazionale di studi, ricerche, informazioni*, Roma: Istituto di Studi Romani.

Roberti, Melchiorre. 1927. 'Le associazioni funerarie cristiane e la proprietà ecclesiastica nei primi tre secoli', in: Albertario, E. (ed.), *Studi dedicati alla memoria di Pier Paolo Zanzucchi*, Milano: Vita e pensiero, 89–113.

Roberts, David D. 1979. *The Syndicalist Tradition and Italian Fascism*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Roersch, Alphonse. 1934. 'Notice sur J.-P. Waltzing', *Annuaire de l'Académie Royale de Belgique/Jaarboek van de Koninklijke Belgische Academie*, Bruxelles: Lambertin, 97–147.

Romanelli, P. 1972. 'Carlo Galassi Paluzzi', *Studi Romani: Rivista trimestrale dell'Istituto di studi romani*, 20/4, 465–468.

Rosser, Gervase. 1994. 'Going to the Fraternity Feast: Commensality and Social Relations in Late Medieval England', *The Journal of British Studies*, 33, 430–446.

Royden, Halsey L. 1988. *The Magistrates of the Roman Professional Collegia in Italy from the First to the Third Century AD*, Pisa: Giardini.

Rüegg, Walter. 2004. 'Chapter 10: Theology and the Arts,' in: Rüegg, W. (ed.), *A History of the University in Europe, Volume III: Universities in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries (1800–1945),* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 393–458.

Russo, Antonella. 1999. *Il fascismo in mostra*, Roma: Editori Riuniti.

Sablayrolles, Robert. 1996. *Libertinus miles: Les cohortes de Vigiles*, Rome: École française de Rome.

Saint-Roch, Patrick (ed.) 1995. *Correspondance de Giovanni Battista de Rossi et de Louis Duchesne, 1873–1894*, Rome: École française de Rome.

Saller, Richard P. and Shaw, Brent D. 1984. 'Tombstones and Roman Family Relations in the Principate: Civilians, Soldiers and Slaves', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 74, 124–156.

Sarfatti, Michele. 1994. *Mussolini contro gli ebrei: Cronaca dell'elaborazione delle leggi del 1938,* Torino: Silvio Zamorani.
Saumagne, Charles. 1954. '"Coire", "Convenire", "Colligi"', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 32, 254–263.
Schiess, Traugott. 1888. *Die römischen collegia funeraticia nach den Inschriften*, München: Theodor Ackermann.
Schmidt, J. 1978. 'Frömmigkeit und Theologie in Schleswig-Holstein von den Anfängen der Christianisierung bis zum Vorabend der Reformation', in Meinhold, Peter (ed.), *Schleswig-Holsteinische Kirchengeschichte*, Neumünster: K. Wachholtz.
Schnapp, Jeffrey T. 1992. 'Epic Demonstrations: Fascist Modernity and the 1932 Exhibition of the Fascist Revolution', in: Golsan, Richard J. (ed.), *Fascism, Aesthetics, and Culture*, Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1–37.
Schneider, Gabriele. 2000. *Mussolini in Afrika: Die faschistische Rassenpolitik in den italienischen Kolonien 1936–1941*, Köln: SH-Verlag.
Schnorr von Carolsfeld, Ludwig. 1933. *Geschichte der juristischen Person*, *Erster (Einziger) Band, Universitas, Corpus, Collegium im klassischen römischen Recht*, München: Beck, revised reprint, Aalen: Scientia Verlag, 1969.
Schulz-Falkenthal, Heinz. 1968. 'Die Unterstützungstätigkeit in einem Militärkollegium der Legio III Augusta in Lambaesis und das Problem der Sozialleistungen im römischen Vereinswesen', Diesner, H.J., Barth, H., and Zimmermann, H.D. (eds.), *Afrika und Rom in der Antike,* Halle: Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, 155–171.
——. 1971. 'Gegenseitigkeitshilfe und Unterstützungstätigkeit in den römischen Handwerkergenossenschaften', *WZ Halle-Wittenberg*, 20, 59–78.
——. 1973. 'Römische Handwerkerkollegien im Dienst der städtischen Gemeinschaft und ihre Begünstigung durch staatliche Privilegien', *WZ Halle-Wittenberg*, 22, 21–35.
Schumacher, Thomas L. 1993. *The Danteum: Architecture, Poetics, and Politics under Italian Fascism*, Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press.
Schwarzenberg, Claudio. 1972. *Il sindacalismo fascista*, Milano: Mursia.
Scriba, Friedemann. 1995a. *Augustus im Schwarzhemd?: Die Mostra Augustea della Romanità in Rom, 1937/38*, Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
——. 1995b. 'Il mito di Roma, l'estetica e gli intellettuali negli anni del consenso: La Mostra Augustea della Romanità 1937/38', *Quaderni di storia*, 41, 67–84.
——. 1996. 'The Sacralization of the Roman Past in Mussolini's Italy: Erudition, Aesthetics, and Religion in the Exhibition of Augustus' Bimillenary in 1937–1938', *Storia della Storiografia*, 30, 19–29.
——. 1998. 'Die Mostra Augustea della Romanità in Rom 1937/38', in Petersen and Schieder 1998, 133–157.
Sergeyenko, M.E. 1972. 'Iz zhizni italiĭskikh kollegiĭ', *Vestnik Drevneĭ Istorii*, 122, 134–138.
Shahan, T., Bishop. 1895. *John Baptist de Rossi, Founder of the Science of Christian Archaeology*, Washington, DC: Stormout & Jackson.
Shaw, Brent D. 2001. *Spartacus and the Slave Wars: A Brief History with Documents*, Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
Simon, A. 1959. 'Doutreloux (Victor-Joseph)', *Biographie Nationale publiée par l'Académie Royale des sciences, des lettres et des beaux-arts de Belgique, Supplément (tome trentième)*, Bruxelles: Bruylant, II, 346–348.
Sitta, Pietro. 1941. 'Lauree e diplomi in Scienze Corporative', in: *Studi in memoria di Giovanni Dettori*, Firenze: Carlo Cya, I, 443–449.
Sordi, Marta and Cavigiolo, Maria Luisa. 1971. 'Un'antica "chiesa domestica" di Roma? (Il *Collegium quod est in domo Sergiae L. f. Paullinae*)', *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia,* 25, 369–374.
Stallworthy, Jon. 1995. *Louis MacNeice*, New York: W.W. Norton.
Stiennon, Jacques. 1991. *Histoire de Liège*, Toulouse: Privat.
Stone, Marla. 1998. *The Patron State: Culture and Politics in Fascist Italy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

——. 1999. 'A flexible Rome: Fascism and the cult of *romanità*', in: Edwards, Catharine (ed.), *Roman Presences. Receptions of Rome in European Culture, 1789–1945*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 205–220.

Strikwerda, Carl. 1997. *A House Divided: Catholics, Socialists, and Flemish Nationalists in Nineteenth-Century Belgium*, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Strong, Eugénie. 1939. '"Romanità" Throughout the Ages', *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 29, 137–166.

Studi. 1936. *Studi in onore di Salvatore Riccobono, nel XL anno del suo insegnamento*, Palermo: Arti grafiche G. Castiglia.

Studi. 1937. *Studi in onore di Michele Barillari*, Bari: Cressati.

Studia Humanitatis. 1942. *Studia Humanitatis. Festschrift zur Eröffnung des Institutes*, Berlin: Helmut Küpper.

Taradel, Ruggero, and Raggi, Barbara. 2000. *La segregazione amichevole: 'La Civiltà Cattolica' e la questione ebraica 1850–1945*, Roma: Editori riuniti.

Teitge, Hans-Erich (ed.) 1966. *Theodor Storms Briefwechsel mit Theodor Mommsen*, Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger.

Thompson, E.P. 1968. *The Making of the English Working Class*, London: Pelican.

Tomassetti, G. 1882. 'Antichità di Lanuvio (Civita-Lavinia)', extract from *La Rassegna Italiana*, Roma: Tipografico Editrice Romana.

Torri, Alberto Paolo. 1939. 'Corporazioni romane e corporazioni bizantine', *Roma*, XVII, 251–257.

——. 1940. 'Le corporazioni romane nei municipi dell'impero', *Roma*, XVIII, 144–151.

——. 1941. *Le Corporazioni romane, cenno storico giuridico economico, con prefazione di Mariano Pierro*, 2nd edition, Roma: G. Bardi.

——. 1956. 'Indagine sulle finanze del Comune di Roma dal 1851 al 1870', *Studi Romani*, 4, 310f.

Tran, Nicolas. 2001. 'Le collège, la communauté et le politique sous le Haut-Empire Romain. Remarques sur l'histoire du droit à la fin du XIXe siècle', *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz*, 12, 181–198.

Université de Liège. 1895. *Association des élèves des écoles spéciales, salle du consérvatoire royale: concert du 26 janvier 1895 au profit de le caisse de prevoyance des ouvriers mineurs de la province de Liège*, Liège: Auguste Bénard, 1895.

——. 1907. *Associations des étudiants en droit. Soirée de Grand Gala organisée au profit de l'oeuvre des enfants moralement abandonnés et des condamnés libérés, 4 janvier 1907.*

van Nijf, Onno. 1997. *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*, Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.

——. 1999. 'Verenigingsleven en stedelijke identiteit: de rol van *fabri, centonarii* en *dendrophori*', *Lampas*, 32, 198–210.

——. 2002. '*Collegia* and civic guards. Two chapters in the history of sociability', in: Jongman, W. and Kleijwegt, M. (eds.), *After the Past. Essays in Ancient History in Honour of H.W. Pleket*, Mnemosyne Supplement 233, Leiden: Brill, 305–339.

Visser, Romke. 1992a. 'Fascist Doctrine and the Cult of the *Romanità*', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 27, 5–22.

——. 1992b. 'Pax Augusta and Pax Mussoliniana', in: van Kessel, P. (ed.), *The Power of Imagery: Essays on Rome, Italy and the Imagination*, Roma: Apeiron editori, 109–130.

——. 2001. 'Da Atene a Roma, da Roma a Berlino: L'Istituto di Studi Romani, il culto fascista della romanità e la "difesa dell'umanesimo" di Giuseppe Bottai (1936–1943)', in: Näf 2001a, 111–123.

Vittoria, Albertina. 1983. *Le riviste del duce: Politica e cultura del regime*, Milano: Guanda.

Waché, Brigitte. 1992. *Monseigneur Louis Duchesne (1843–1922): Historien de l'Église, Directeur de l'École française de Rome*, Rome: École française de Rome.

Waltzing, Jean-Pierre. 1891. Review of Liebenam 1890, *Revue de l'instruction publique en Belgique*, 34, 106–123 and 161–176.

——. 1892a. *L'épigraphie latine et les corporations professionnelles de l'empire Romain: Leçon d'ouverture (11 Février 1892) du Cours d'Épigraphie latine professé à l'Université de Liège pendant l'année académique 1891–1892*, Gand: Siffer.
——. 1892b. *Le recueil général des inscriptions latines (Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum) et l'épigraphie latine depuis 50 ans,* Louvain: Charles Peeters.
——. 1895a. *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains, depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'Occident*, Tome I, Louvain: Peeters.
——. 1895b. 'Les corporations de l'ancienne Rome et la charité', *Compte rendu du troisième Congrès scientifique international des catholiques,* Bruxelles: Société belge de librairie, 165–190.
——. 1895c. 'The Roman Guilds and Charity', translation of Waltzing 1895b, *Charities Review*, 4, 337–368.
——. 1896. *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains, depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'Occident*, Tome II, Louvain: Peeters.
——. 1898/9. 'Les collèges funéraires chez les Romains', *Le Musée Belge*, 2, 281–294 and 3, 130–157.
——. 1899. *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains, depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'Occident*, Tome III, Louvain: Peeters.
——. 1900. *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains, depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'Occident*, Tome IV, Louvain: Peeters.
——. 1912. 'La thèse de J.-B. de Rossi sur les collèges funéraires chrétiens', *Bulletins de la Classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques et de la Classe des beaux-arts*, 6, 387–401.
——. 1913. 'Le grec et le latin devant la Commission de Réforme des Humanités', Communication faite dans les Séances plénières de la Commission le 11 Novembre, le 25 Novembre et le 9 Décembre 1912, Louvain: Peeters.
Weber, Volker. 1977. 'Zur Geschichte des römischen Vereinswesens', *Klio*, 59, 247–256.
——. 1993. 'Zum Kollegienwesen: Die Berufsvereine in Handwerk und Handel', in: Johne, Klaus-Peter (ed.), *Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft des Römischen Reiches im 3. Jahrhundert: Studien zu ausgewählten Problemen*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 101–134.
Wells, H.G. 1905. *Kipps: The Story of a Simple Soul*, London: Macmillan.
Whitman, James Q. 1990. *The Legacy of Roman Law in the German Romantic Era: Historical Vision and Legal Change*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
——. 1991. 'Of Corporatism, Fascism, and the First New Deal', *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 39, 747–778.
Wickert, Lothar. 1959–1980. *Theodor Mommsen. Eine Biographie*, Frankfurt/Main: V. Klostermann.
——. 1962. *Theodor Mommsen. Otto Jahn, Briefwechsel, 1842–1868*, Frankfurt/Main: V. Klostermann.
Wilken, Robert L. 1984. *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
Wilkins, Ann Thomas. 2005. 'Augustus, Mussolini, and the Parallel Imagery of Empire', in: Lazzaro, Claudia and Crum, Roger J. (eds.), *Donatello Among the Blackshirts: History and Modernity in the Visual Culture of Fascist Italy*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 53–65.
Willing, Matthias. 1991. *Althistorische Forschung in der DDR: Eine wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Studie zur Entwicklung der Disziplin Alte Geschichte vom Ende des Zweiten Weltkrieges bis zur Gegenwart (1945–1989)*, Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
Zaccaria, Claudio. 1987. 'Forme di promozione sociale ad Aquileia nei primi secoli dell'impero', *Antichità Altoadriatiche*, 29, 129–149.
Zagarrio, Vito. 1976. 'Bottai: un fascista critico?', *Studi storici*, 17, 267–272.
Zangemeister K., Jacobs, E., and Rebenich, St. (eds.) 2000. *Theodor Mommsen als Schriftsteller: ein Verzeichnis seiner Schriften*, Hildesheim: Weidmann.
Zecchini, Valerio (ed.) 2000. *Futurismo e Fascismo: Manifesti e programmi*, Bologna: Planetario.

Zimmermann, Carola. 2002. *Handwerkervereine im griechischen Osten des Imperium Romanum*, Mainz: Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum.
Zuccotti, Susan. 2000. *Under his Very Windows: The Vatican and the Holocaust in Italy*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
——. 2004. 'Pope Pius XII and the Rescue of Jews in Italy: Evidence of a Papal Directive?', *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, 18, 255–273.
Zuckerman, Larry. 2004. *The Rape of Belgium: The Untold Story of World War I*, New York: New York University Press.

EPIGRAPHIC INDEX

L'Année Épigraphique

1909, #215 33 n. 31
1935, #25 33 n. 31

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum

2.5500 53 n. 97

3.14165 147

5.337 148
5.908 11–13
5.909 13
5.1220 12
5.2176 13
5.5446 12

6.2193 149
6.4416 33 n. 31
6.10268–10285 41, 54–55
6.10270 51
6.10277 54
6.10412 49–50
6.29691 33 n. 31

10.7039 1–4

11.1031 148
11.6244 53

12.2228 9
12.3166 8, 10

13.1745 8–10

14.2112 20–22, 29–30, 32–35, 50, 79, 148, 204–205, 209

GENERAL INDEX

Acíto, Alfredo, 106, 109–110
anti-Semitism (see also Jews), 156–157, 184–190
Ara Pacis, 139, 140, 215
Augustus, 6, 8, 135, 137–138, 148, 158, 169
Ausbüttel, Frank M., 93–94, 210

Bandini, Vincenzo, 110–111
Bari, 89, 90, 93, 94
Bianchi Bandinelli, Ranuccio, 180, 194, 198
Bismarck, Otto von, 65
Boissier, Gaston, 37
Bottai, Giuseppe, 19, 160, 221, 223
  and Jews, 139, 184–188
  at the Ara Pacis, 139, 155–157, 215
  correspondence with Galassi Paluzzi, 136–137, 138, 163–165, 167–168, 170–171, 174
  Dalla Corporazione romana . . ., 19–20, 160–173, 189
  Diario, 155–156, 215–217
  German translation of *Dalla Corporazione romana* . . ., 170–172
  in Africa, 174
  Minister of the Corporations, 92, 94 n. 22, 102, 127, 130, 133
  on Augustus, 137–138
  on Virgil, 135–137
  treatises of, for the Istituto di Studi Romani, 173–179, 182–183

Calderini, Aristide, 113–114, 129
Carcopino, Jérôme, 132 n. 49, 221–222
Carli, Filippo, 108–109
Carta del Lavoro, 112, 166–167, 191
Christian Democracy, 70, 85, 116, 197
Cohn, Max/Conrat, Max, 33, 37, 64, 68, 205
Colini, Antonio, 144–145, 146
collegium/collegia history of, 5–7
collegia centonariorum, 7–16
collegia fabr(or)um, 6, 9–12
'collegia funeraticia', 30–32, 35–36, 48, 52, 54–55, 60, 62, 72
collegium salutare (cultores) Dianae et Antinoi, 20–22, 28, 30–35, 50, 79, 148, 204–205, 209
collegia tenuorium, 30–31, 35, 62, 68–69
commensality, 207, 211–212
'Corporativismo', 19, 89–93, 95–98, 99, 102, 104, 130, 131, 146, 165, 222
corpus/corpora, 6, 107–108, 116–117, 152
Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, 5
  collaborators in, 42–43
  genesis of, 18, 28–29
  organization of, 7, 32
  uses of, 64, 74–75

De Francisci, Pietro, 134–135
De Robertis, Francesco Maria, 19
  'Corporativismo romano . . .' (1934), 94–100, 109, 165–166, 189
  criticism of Lo Bianco, 105–106, 199
  death and commemoration of, 93, 200
  Il diritto associativo romano . . . (1938), 93, 100–101, 114–118, 152, 196
  Il fenomeno associativo nel mondo romano . . . (1955), 93, 198–199
  influence of, 93–94, 193
  post-War works of, 193–200
  Scritti varii di diritto romano . . . (1987), 93, 95 n. 25
  Storia delle corporazioni . . . (1971), 93, 198–200
De Rossi, Giovanni Battista, 18
  and 'Christian archaeology', 46–47
  as Vatican *scriptor*, 42–44, 57
  'I collegii funeraticii famigliari . . .' (1877), 40–41, 54–55
  correspondence with Duchesne, 52–54, 55–57
  friendship with Mommsen, 41–42, 44–45, 55–57
  on *collegia* and Christians, 41, 48–51, 52–54, 58–60, 222
  personal epigraphic collection of, 54
  political opinions of, 45, 46
  La Roma sotterranea cristiana . . . (1864–1877), 41, 51, 54
Di Marzio, Cornelio, 132–133, 189–190
dolabrarius/dolabrarii, 11–13
Dopolavoro, 105, 147, 148, 164

Doutreloux, Victor-Joseph, 83–85, 88
Duchesne, Louis, 52–53, 55–56, 58, 60
Duff, P.W., 94, 100, 111, 149 n. 116
Duseigneur, Marcel, 66

Fascism, 98–101, 120–121, 192
'Foro Mussolini', 191–192
Frank, Tenney, 168, 196, 203
'Friendly Societies', 207–208

Galassi Paluzzi, Carlo, 19, 119–120, 221
  correspondence with Bottai, 136–137, 138, 163–165, 167–168, 170–171, 174
  on Bottai, 175–177
  on Greeks, 178–179
  on the Mostra Augustea della Romanità, 140–142
  on Romanità, 120, 122, 128, 129–130
  political opinions of, 122–123, 125
Gentile, Giovanni, 96–97, 104
Gérard, Albert, 66–67
Giglioli, G.Q., 140, 141, 144–145, 146–148
Gramsci, Antonio, 116, 193, 194, 198
Greece and Greeks, 178–181, 218–219
Gregorovius, Ferdinand, 46–47, 57

Henzen, Wilhelm, 34, 43–44
hetaeriae, 6
Hirschfeld, Otto, 8–14, 16–17
Hitler, Adolf, 158, 162, 180–181, 185, 216–217
Hopkins, Keith, 4, 61 n. 4, 208–210, 211, 220

Istituto di Studi Romani, 19–20, 119–120, 121, 122, 124
  archives of, 135, 162
  publications of, 121–126, 127–133, 149–152, 162–170, 173–179

Jahn, Otto, 28, 42
Jews (see also anti-Semitism), 50, 122, 139, 155–156, 158, 184–190

Kornemann, Ernst, 14, 201
Kraus, Franz Xaver, 45 n. 75, 56
Kurth, Godefroid, 70, 85, 88

lanarii carminatores, 148
Lanzillo, Agostino, 95–97, 109
Latin, proposed revival of, 129–130, 131
Leicht, Pier Silverio, 102–103, 106–109
Leo XIII, Pope, 57–58, 69–70, 83–84
Léopold II, of Belgium, 83–85
Liebenam, Wilhelm, 67–69, 71–72, 199, 203
Liège, 19, 70–71, 77, 83–86
Linderski, Jerzy, 79 n. 57
Lo Bianco, Francesco G., 102, 104–106, 107, 110, 127, 132–133, 143, 149–152
Lyast, R.Y., 203–204

MacMullen, Ramsay, 205–207
MacNeice, Louis, 216–221, 223
marmorarii convivae, 1–4
Marquardt, Joachim, 9
Marxism and Marxist analysis, 20, 70, 83, 189–190, 193, 194–196, 202, 205
Mattingly, Harold, 111
Maué, Hermann, 14, 65
Minio-Paluello, Lorenzo, 92, 118
Momigliano, Arnaldo, 90, 134
Mommsen, Theodor, 74, 115, 182
  as a student, 22–25
  De collegiis et sodaliciis Romanorum (1843), 18, 22, 28–36, 64
  epigraphic commentary of, 11–12, 34–35
  family of, 23, 25, 26, 27, 37–39
  friendship with De Rossi, 41–42, 44–45
  Nobel Prize for Literature, 18, 40
  on religion, 38–40, 45, 48, 60, 222
  poetry of, 26–27, 38
  work on *C. I. L.*, 42–44
Monti, Gennaro Maria, 58, 90, 101, 105, 108
Morra, Ottorino, 119, 123–124, 125
Mostra Archeologica (1911), 142
Mostra Augustea della Romanità (1937–1938), 19, 127, 139–149, 155–158
Mostra della Rivoluzione Fascista (1932 and 1937), 137, 141–142, 144
Museo della Civiltà Romana, 143, 145
Mussolini, Benito, 89–90, 91–92, 94, 110, 111, 118, 123, 152, 155–156, 159, 177, 181, 184–185, 216–217

Nazi Germany, 120–121, 150, 161, 179–183
Numa Pompilius, 6, 75, 79

Ostia, 8, 144, 149, 203–204

Pallottino, Massimo, 148, 158
Pino-Branca, Alfredo, 102–104, 105, 106
Pius IX, Pope, 46, 57, 69
Pius XI, Pope, 125
Pius XII, Pope, 125–126
Pliny the Younger, 6, 9, 64
Pompeii, 145
Pross, Elise, 170–171

race and racism, 109, 117, 153, 156–157, 158–159, 172, 184–190
Radin, Max, 88
Ratti, Nicola, 21–22
Rebenich, Stefan, 38–39, 41, 44, 221
Risorgimento, 95, 100, 138
Roma (journal of the ISR), 19, 121, 122, 124–125, 127–133
Romanità, 20, 119–120, 122–124, 159–160, 161–162, 173–174, 222
Rostovtzeff, Mikhail, 165 n. 34, 203, 204

Sarfatti, Margherita, 155–156, 215
Schiess, Traugott, 64–65, 68, 72
Schnorr von Carolsfeld, Ludwig, 201
Schulz-Falkenthal, Heinz, 202–203
Senatus Consulta, 22, 29–30, 32–34, 50
Sergeyenko, M.Ye., 203–205
'State' and Statism, 62–63, 81–83, 92, 97, 102, 104, 110, 114, 151, 165
Storm, Theodor, 23–26
Strong, Eugénie Sellers, 139, 157–158

Terragni, Giuseppe, 156, 215
Tertullian, 52–53, 58
Torri, Alberto Paolo, 111–112, 131
Trajan, 6, 9

van Nijf, Onno M., 14–15, 211–213
Vigiles, 8–9, 129

Waltzing, Jean-Pierre, 14, 19, 102, 103, 115, 193, 198, 199, 203, 205
  and Belgian politics, 84–85
  background of, 70–71
  Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles . . . (1895–1900), 63, 70, 72, 75–83, 87–88, 100, 206, 213, 222, 223
  on Christian charity, 86–87
  on the De Rossi thesis, 58
  on his predecessors, 65–66, 67, 71–72
  on school reform and the classics, vi, 20, 73–74, 213
  on the science of epigraphy, 72–73, 74
  on workers' freedoms, 82–83, 169–170
Wickert, Lothar, 24–25, 44